SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 00917 7933

DATE DUE

GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

LITTLE JENNINGS AND FIGHTING DICK TALBOT

From the painting by Mary Beale. By kind permission of Earl Spencer.

FRANCES JENNINGS,
DUCHESS OF TYRCONNEL.

LITTLE JENNINGS AND FIGHTING DICK TALBOT

A Life of the Duke and Duchess of :: :: :: Tyrconnel. :: :: ::

By PHILIP W. SERGEANT

With Seventeen Illustrations, including Two Photogravure Frontispieces

VOL. I.

London: HUTCHINSON & CO.
Paternoster Row :: :: :: 1913

B
T981s 1

HISTORY DEPARTMENT

101773

3 1223 00917 7933

PREFACE

I FEAR that it may seem to readers of this book—to those at least, who persevere to the end—that its title is a misnomer, that it would more aptly have been named "Materials for a Life of Richard Talbot, Duke of Tyrconnel, with some Details about his second Wife." The original plan did not contemplate the unequal division of the space between Richard Talbot and Frances Jennings which has been made in the following pages. But some books insist, as it were, on writing themselves, of developing independently of preconceived schemes. That has been the case with *Little Jennings and Fighting Dick Talbot*. I have yielded to the claims of the forceful husband to overshadow his wife, though aware that thereby the symmetry of the work has been impaired.

Of Talbot it cannot be said, in the words of the early English translation of Rochefoucauld's Maxims: "Some Persons are so extreamly whiffling and inconsiderable, that they are as far from any real *Faults*, as they are from substantial *Vertues*." Talbot had abundance of real faults as well as some substantial virtues. I have in no way attempted to conceal the faults or to magnify unduly the virtues, but have tried to present the actual man, with the aid chiefly of his own writings and the estimates of his contemporaries. Few characters in English history have suffered more grievously from prejudice, and the only remedy appeared to me to get back to the documents of the period and examine in them the evidence for the charges brought against Talbot. In some places this has involved what may seem over-elaboration of detail; but apart from the article in the *Dictionary of National Biography* there has been

no complete Life of Richard Talbot written hitherto, and therefore the present is in a sense a pioneer work. I hope that at least it may serve as part basis one day for a biography such as is merited by a very striking personality. I am conscious that there is still much more material to be discovered by patient research, for which, alas! more time and money would be required than are mine. There are in existence in various parts of England and Ireland many unpublished letters written by Richard Talbot—and a few by Frances Jennings—which no doubt would have thrown additional light upon my subject, had I been able to consult them. Unhappily magic carpets are not among the goods which an author can acquire "upon easy terms."

The sources of information to which I have gone are recorded in the Notes. I should like to acknowledge here, however, the assistance of the following modern books as guides to some of those sources, which I might otherwise have overlooked: *The Travels of the King*, by Miss Eva Scott; *Mary of Modena*, by Mr. Martin Haile; *Revolutionary Ireland*, by the Rev. R. H. Murray; *The Battle of the Boyne*, by Mr. D. C. Boulger; *The English Court in Exile*, by Mr. and Mrs. Grew; and Mr. Allan Fea's edition of the *Memoirs of Gramont*.

I have also to record my gratitude to Lady Baillie-Hamilton for her very kind aid and information with regard to the Hamilton family in the Seventeenth Century, not only on points mentioned in my Notes, but on many others, too, which do not there appear.

PHILIP W. SERGEANT.

December, 1912.

POSTSCRIPT.—The final revision of the proofs of this book had almost been completed when there was issued by the Clarendon Press the *Journal of John Stevens*, edited by the Rev. R. H. Murray. I need only state that my transcription of the manuscript was made independently, and that I was unaware that Dr. Murray was engaged upon the work.

CONTENTS

PART I

FRANCES JENNINGS

PART II

RICHARD TALBOT

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	—Early Days	17
II.	—A Plot against Cromwell	35
III.	—Under a Cloud	58
IV.	—Life in Flanders	74
V.	—Talbot and his Traducers	93
VI.	—The Irish Champion	117

PART III

WHITEHALL

I.	—The Hamiltons	143
II.	—Mistress Jennings at Court	158
III.	—Talbot in the Tower again	174
IV.	—The Diversions of a Maid of Honour	184
V.	—Two Marriages	200

Contents

CHAP.		PAGE
VI.	Lady Hamilton	207
VII.	Talbot as Irish Agent	221
VIII.	Intrigues and Disasters	244
IX.	Victims of Titus Oates	258

PART IV

TEN YEARS TOGETHER

I.	The Marriage of Richard and Frances	279
II.	The Lifting of the Cloud	288
III.	Preparations for the Struggle	300
IV.	Clarendon v. Tyrconnel	316

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FRANCES JENNINGS, DUCHESS OF TYRCONNEL (*Photogravure*) . . . . . *Frontispiece*
From the painting by Mary Beale at Althorpe, by kind permission of Lord Spencer.

To Face Page

MRS. JENNINGS (FRANCES THORNHURST) . . . 14
From a photograph of the painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller at Althorpe, by kind permission of Lord Spencer.

JAMES, DUKE OF YORK, AFTERWARDS JAMES II. . . 84
From a photograph, by Emery Walker, of the painting by Sir Peter Lely at St. James's Palace.

GODITHA PRICE 158
From an engraving by Bartolozzi, after the painting by Sir Peter Lely.

FRANCES JENNINGS, DUCHESS OF TYRCONNEL . . . 184
From an engraving after a painting by Sir Peter Lely.

SIR GEORGE (COUNT) HAMILTON 200
From a photograph, by Emery Walker, of the painting in the National Portrait Gallery, London.

SARAH JENNINGS, DUCHESS OF MARLBOROUGH . . . 220
From an engraving by Bond, after the painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller in Lord Spencer's collection.

JAMES BUTLER, DUKE OF ORMONDE 272
From an engraving by Robinson, after the painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller in Lord Strathmore's collection.

RICHARD TALBOT, DUKE OF TYRCONNEL 302
From a photograph of the Indian ink drawing in the National Portrait Gallery, Dublin, after "a painting in the hands of Mr. Sykes, painter in Lincoln's Inn Fields" (by Sir Godfrey Kneller).

"Little Jennings and Fighting Dick Talbot"

PART I

FRANCES JENNINGS

IT is a curious fact, but by no means uncommon, that the record of the early years of celebrated women should be difficult to trace. Such is the case with Frances Jennings, child-beauty of the Court of Charles II. and one of the chief ornaments of the Court of his brother. For the first part of her story the materials are indeed scanty. They would be scantier still, had not her much junior sister Sarah, following her example in becoming maid of honour to the wife of James, Duke of York, attracted the affections of the young guardsman Jack Churchill and, finding in him a kindred spirit, helped him to rise almost to the summit of their joint ambitions. For, notable characters as were Frances and her second husband, Richard Talbot, in the circle of James II., so little attention was paid by writers after

the Revolution of 1688 to the truth about adherents of the beaten cause that the origins of Frances at least might have been forgotten but for the prominence of her sister at the Courts of King James's successors. The brilliance of Duchess Sarah, however, was such that the memory of the Jennings family was made to shine by reflected light. What Frances deserved on her own account she obtained to a certain extent on her sister's, and in consequence we find on record a little more than, in the circumstances, we might have expected.

Unfortunately neither the date nor the place of the birth of Frances Jennings is preserved in any document now known to exist. Of the nine children four sons and five daughters, born to her parents, the birthdays of three and the baptismal days of three more can be traced, and the year of birth of yet another can be approximately fixed. But in the case of Frances and her eldest brother John, we have to rely on deduction or conjecture. John did nothing beyond succeeding for a brief while to the remains of the family estate, to save himself from obscurity. Frances, although she outlived her fame by more than forty years, certainly merited such honour as is implied in the survival of a true record of age. As will be seen, rumour at her decease imputed to her an absurdly incorrect length of life.

Among the extant marriage licences for the month of December, 1643, is one which runs: "Richar

Jenyns, Esq., of St. Alban's, Herts, Bachelor, 28, and Frances Thornurst, of St. Martin's Fields, Spinster, 18, her father dead; consent of her mother, the now Lady Lister, wife of Sir Martin Lister, Kt.; at St. Martin's af[ore]s[ai]d, St. Giles in the Fields, or St. Paul's, Covent Garden."

The parties mentioned were the father and mother of the heroine of this work. Richard Jennings, or Jenyns, was the eldest son of one branch of a family whose origin (thanks to the interest aroused in all things connected with Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough) has been traced back without a break to the beginning of the Fifteenth Century,* when a certain John Jenyn was Mayor of Guildford, Surrey, in 1413 and 1435. Barnard, a great-grandson of the mayor, was a skinner in the City of London, but with his son Ralph the family began to rise above the level of commerce to the rank of country gentlemen. Ralph's first wife brought him land from her father, Ralph Rowlat, a goldsmith, to whom Henry VIII. gave a knighthood and the manors of Sandridge and Holywell, both near St. Albans. By his second wife, Joan, daughter of Henry Brounker, he had four children. One son, John, went to Oxford and the Middle Temple and was afterwards

* Mrs. Arthur Colvile, in *Duchess Sarah*, quotes the authority of Mr. Thomas Perry for the supposed descent of John Jenyn from a Genoese captain of archers who came to England in the Thirteenth Century. She points out another remote Italian strain also: Alicia Spencer, wife of Sir John Jennings, junior, was the great-great-granddaughter of one Anthony Cavalery.

knighted by James I. Like his father, Sir John married twice, his second wife—his cousin Ann Brounker—bearing him a son, who was named after himself John and who also received the honour of knighthood. Sir John Jennings the second married Alicia, daughter of Sir Richard Spencer, a Hertfordshire neighbour, and by her had a huge family.* In 1626, the year after his knighthood, he was chosen as High Sheriff of Hertfordshire, and in 1640 the mayor and burgesses of St. Albans elected him as one of their two representatives in the Parliament afterwards known as the Long. Two years later he died, leaving property to the value of about £4,000 per annum.

Richard inherited from his father not only Holywell and Sandridge, but also the manors of Churchill in Somerset and Fanne in Surrey. He succeeded him too as member for St. Albans, though he was only twenty-two years of age. In the following year he took to wife, as we have seen, Frances, daughter of the deceased Kentish baronet, Sir Gifford Thornhurst, of Agnes Court, Old Romford, by Susanna, daughter of Sir Alexander Temple. The Thornhurst family had

* Sarah Jennings appears to have been uncertain as to the number. In a letter in *The Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough*, Vol. II p. 112, she writes: "My father had in all two-and-twenty brothers and sisters." In *An Account of the Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough*, which she published in 1742, she says, "Our grandfather, Sir John Jenyns, had two-and-twenty children, by which means the estate of the family (which was reputed to be about £4000 a year) came to be divided into small parcels."

several memorials in Canterbury Cathedral, and Frances was her father's heiress. To Richard Jennings a dowry was welcome, since not only was he one of a host of brothers and sisters, but the Civil War had begun to involve his property, like that of so many other Cavaliers. His marriage improved his position, and his prospects may well have seemed to him bright again when he brought his bride to his home in Whitehall, where, when not at Holywell, the family had been living since Sir John had been elected for St. Albans. But the struggle between King and Parliament brought him to ruin. He had not long been married when he and one of his brothers, Charles, were obliged to raise money by giving a bond for £20,000 to Sir Martin Lister, second husband of Richard's mother-in-law. Still he was reduced to selling Churchill, which had been purchased by Ralph, son of the skinner, and other property in Somerset.* This did not save him,

* Sir Winston Churchill, father of the first Duke of Marlborough, writing to Blue Mantle at the Herald's Office on June 22nd, 1686, concerning his pedigree, says: "My eldest son is the present Ld. Churchill, who has marryd Sarah, one of the daughters and co-heires of Richard Jennings of St. Albans, the unfortunate looser of the mannor of Churchill, which is now to be sold, but my son, being disappointed of having it given to him, as Sir John Churchill allways did promise him, refuses to buy it." According to Sir Winston, Churchill was originally the property of his family; but Edward I. seized on the lordship because one of the family had been active in the Barons' War. In the reign of Henry VIII. the Jenningses became possessed of it. Richard Jennings sold it to Sir John Churchill, Master of the Rolls. The manor, complains Sir Winston, had come to his own son, "had it not been so unfortunately alienated by her [Sarah's] said father." (*Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, Bath MSS.*, Vol. II.)

however, for on December 31st, 1650, there was an order in council to compel him to leave Whitehall, where he was sheltering himself from arrest for debt; and it was so peremptory in tone that we cannot doubt that it was carried out.

In spite of his vicissitudes Richard Jennings rapidly became the father of a large number of children. The registers of St. Margaret's, Westminster, record the baptism of his eldest daughter Susanna on February 25th, 1645, when he had been married about fifteen months. The baptismal entries relating to the next three children, John, Frances and Barbara, have yet to be discovered; but we have evidence that Barbara was born in either 1651 or early 1652.* The births of John and Frances have therefore to be placed between the years 1646 and 1650. It seems probable, from what we hear of Frances about the time when she went to be maid of honour to the Duchess of York, that she was her brother's junior rather than his senior, so that we may conjecture him to have been born about 1647 and her about 1649.

Were the place of Barbara's birth known, we should also know something of what happened to the Jennings family, parents and children, between the time of their expulsion from Whitehall and their

* According to her marriage license she was about twenty-two on April 12th 1673; according to her epitaph at St. Albans she was in her twenty-seventh year when she died on March 22nd, 1678. See Appendix A.

return to the St. Albans neighbourhood.* As it is, we cannot show them to have been in the latter place before 1653. In that year a little Richard was baptized at the Abbey on July 5th. He died eleven months later, and the same name was given to another boy, baptized on October 12th, 1654. The second Richard was cut off even younger, being only ten months at his death. In the spring of the same year, 1655, the burial of the eldest girl of the family, Susanna, is recorded. The same name, taken no doubt from the maternal grandmother Susanna Temple, was bestowed on another daughter, born on July 11th, 1656; but within six months she was in her grave. On October 16th of this year occurred the birth of the youngest son, Ralph (or Ralfe, as he appears in the St. Albans register), who happily escaped the fate of his three immediate predecessors and survived beyond infancy.

This completes the list of the children of Richard and Frances Jennings before the Restoration.† On June 5th, a week after that event, was born Sarah, last and best known, and alone with Frances the younger destined to a long span of life.

* On May 6th, 1650, a Richard Jennings was granted a pass by the existing Government to go to Holland (*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1650). Is it possible that this was our Richard Jennings, and that, seven months before his expulsion from Whitehall, he was looking for a refuge for his family on the Continent in event of serious trouble?

† See Appendix A.

Richard Jennings, had he not been the father of two such daughters, would have made no mark upon the history of his time. All that is known concerning him after his return to Hertfordshire is that he was again one of the representatives of St. Albans in the Convention Parliament which invited King Charles back to England. In view of his alleged military services and pecuniary losses in the Royalist cause, we should have expected to find Charles knighting Richard Jennings, as Charles's father and grandfather knighted those of Richard Jennings. But no such honour was bestowed on him. The introduction of his daughter to the household of the Duchess of York appears to have been the only favour which he obtained. Either the King was ungrateful, or else Jennings's impoverished condition was thought to be due to other causes besides his loyalty alone. He remained in poor circumstances until the day of his death, which occurred on May 8th, 1668. Three weeks later his effects were administered by his chief creditor, Anthony Mildmay, his widow having renounced probate. It was, no doubt, her memories of straitened days of childhood in the Hertfordshire home which caused Sarah Jennings later in life to speak of having "raised her family out of the dirt." Sarah had, however, some reason for gratitude to her mother, if the contemporary story be true which made Mrs. Jennings aid her youngest daughter to marriage with the man

of her heart; and moreover by her will she left Sarah everything on her death.*

It may be imagined that the younger Frances's change of faith after her first marriage had something to do with her mother's unfriendliness to her, as evinced by her passing her over in favour of Sarah. But it was scarcely a recommendation of character to be the favourite of Mrs. Jennings, whose name in the scandalous history of her period is very bad. Some discount must be made, no doubt, for the virulent hatred of the enemies of the Duke of Marlborough, which extended itself to all connected with him—including his mother-in-law. Mrs. Jennings's chief traducer is Mary de la Riviere Manley, author of *The New Atalantis* and *The Adventures of Rivella*, whose savage treatment of Marlborough we may suppose to have been partly inspired by her association with the Duchess of Cleveland. While living with her patron at Arlington Street, Piccadilly, Mrs. Manley must often have been regaled with abuse of the gallant who "lived to refuse his mistress half-a-crown."† And *Rivella*, although she

* Mrs. Jennings's will, dated February 12th, 1692, and proved January 11th, 1694, bequeathed all her manors, estate, personalty, etc., to Sarah for her sole and separate use, so that "my dear son-in-law, John, Earl of Marlborough, though I love him from my heart, shall not intermeddle therein, but be wholly debarred" (Steinman, *Althorp Memoirs*, biography of Mrs. Jennings). She directed that she should be buried in St. Albans Abbey Church, as near as possible to her "four first children"—*i. e.*, apparently, Susanna, John, Barbara and Ralph, omitting those who died in early infancy.

† See *My Lady Castlemaine*, pp. 189-90, 274 *ff.*

subsequently quarrelled with *Hilaria*, was too fond of evil-speaking to spare the latter's enemies on that account.

Some of Mrs. Manley's accusations against Mrs Jennings cannot be reproduced here, since in making them this pioneer among feminine realists in England gives full play to her coarseness. While calling her procuress, she elaborates the charge far beyond the limits of decency, and suggests that she would have been eminent at the court of the Emperor Tiberius. Nor is Mrs. Jennings represented by her as one-sided in her moral delinquency. She was "all that was scandalous, impious and detestable." Among other failings, "she was a very careless speaker, not to say false, and at every word us'd to reiterate and wish that she might rot and perish alive, when the matter in question was never so untrue; which according as happened," adds Mrs. Manley, giving an extraordinary and unpleasant account of the death which befell her.

The most odd of the charges against Mrs. Jennings is to the effect that she was a dealer in magic. In the last volume of *The New Atalantis* she appears as *Damareta*, and it is related how she became a "witch or sorceress." Her teacher was "a person named *Timias*, whose father left him a large inheritance and a little ambition; averse to the marriage-state and yet a votary to Venus." *Timias* is the celebrated Sir Kenelm Digby, son of one of the Gunpowder plotters, whose interest in "chymistry" and the

studies then considered to be allied with it is well known. According to Mrs. Manley, Mrs. Jennings, when newly married, was a neighbour to Sir Kenelm Digby, and "her youth and gaiety put her among the number of those who had the good fortune to please *Timias*." She was very angry with a certain young lady who had robbed her of a lover, and surrendered herself to the reputed magician in return for his aid in accomplishing the lady's ruin. After this *Damareta* retained the affections of *Timias* until his death—the *Empress Irene* (*i.e.* Sarah Jennings) being his supposed daughter—and was taught his art by him.

Whatever be the basis of this preposterous tale, in which the insinuation about the paternity of the Duchess of Marlborough can easily be disproved, it is a fact that Mrs. Jennings somehow or other obtained the reputation of being a witch, as the Tories of Queen Anne's reign delighted to remember. In a squib attributed to Swift and entitled *The Story of the St. Albans Ghost or the Apparition of Mother Haggy*,* published in 1712, Mrs. Jennings figures as

* In his edition of Swift, Sir Walter Scott quotes in a footnote to this some lines of the period:

No wonder storms more dreadful are by far
Than all the losses of a twelve years' war;
No wonder prelates do the church betray,
Old statesmen vote and act a different way;
No wonder magic arts surround the throne,
Old Mother Jennings in her Grace is known;
Old England's genius rouse, her charms dispel,
Burn but the witch, and all things will do well.

Mother Haggy. The *Story* is a fatuous piece o political pamphleteering, but one passage from it i perhaps worth quotation, as an example of the wa in which it was held permissible to speak of th deceased Mrs. Jennings:

"Mother Haggy was married to a plain homespu yeoman of St. Alban's, and lived in good repute fo some years; the place of her birth is disputed b some of the most celebrated moderns, though the have a tradition in the country that she was neve born at all, and which is most probable. At th birth of her daughter Haggite [Sarah] somethin happened very remarkable, and which gave occasio to the neighbourhood to mistrust she held a corre spondence with old Nick, as was confirmed afterwards beyond the possibility of disproof. The neighbour were got together a-merry-making, as they term it in the country, when the old woman's high-crowne hat, that had been thrown upon the bed's teste during the heat of the engagement, leaped with wonderful agility into the cradle, and being catche at by the nurse, was metamorphosed into a coronet which, according to her description, was not muc unlike that of a German prince; but it soon brok into a thousand pieces. 'Such,' cries old Mothe Haggy, 'will be the fortune of my daughter and suc her fall.'"

Mrs. Manley also credits Mrs. Jennings with insigh into the future, making her present at the birth c

ohn Churchill, "having a friendship with his mother," nd foretell his rise to greatness.*

We cannot hope to extract from these ferocious ibels upon her mother any information with regard o the early training which the younger Frances ennings received at her hands. From the description f her in the *Memoirs of Gramont* we gather that at east her natural gifts were well developed when she eft St. Albans. Mrs. Manley, it may be noted, peaking of Sarah's first arrival at Court many years ater, says that her mother "gave her in charge to make all things subservient to Interest, discreetly telling her that Virtue was no more than a Name, and Chastity less, since it was much to be doubted whether there ever was such a Thing." Mrs. Jennings accompanied her youngest daughter to St. James's Palace. She did not so accompany Frances. Against neither of them does there seem the slightest justification for accusations of looseness of morals; though such were made against them by contemporary enemies, as might have been expected, and have been unhappily repeated in more modern days, when we might have hoped for more decent regard of the truth.†

When, therefore, Frances came to London at the age of about fifteen, to be maid of honour to the

* *New Atalantis*, I., 28, IV., 50. In the first passage Churchill is "The Count"; in the second "(the now great) *Stauratius*."

† See below, pp. 189-90, 524; and cp. Macaulay's insinuations against Sarah.

Duchess of York, it was without the very dubious advantage of her mother's protection—though it must be admitted that in 1676 Mrs. Jennings displayed a concern for Sarah's moral welfare which other mothers of personally infamous character, have likewise been known to show with regard to their daughters. But Frances was fortunate in one respect. Coming "directly from the country to the Court," as Gramont says, and perhaps having seen no more of the great events which had recently happened than Monk's arrival at St. Albans with his army in January 1660, she passed under the care of the Duchess of York. The latter, despite the calumnies against her had some regard for the character of her attendants and was "reforming" her household at the time when she introduced Frances into it. The little Jennings came to Court under better auspices than the little Stewart, for instance, although the latter was brought by her own mother. Anne Hyde had a stronger will than Catherine of Braganza, and if both did their best to shield their pretty maids of honour the Duchess was decidedly more successful than the Queen. We must not detract, however, from the credit of Frances Jennings herself, who was able so early in life to hold her own with a crowd of admirers which began with the King and his brother and ended with Dick Talbot.

From the painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller at Althorpe, by kind permission of Earl Spencer.

MRS. JENNINGS (FRANCES THORNHURST).

PART II

RICHARD TALBOT

CHAPTER I

EARLY DAYS

RICHARD TALBOT, the man whom Lord Macaulay chose to make, with his brother-in-w John Churchill, one of the two blackest villains n the story of the last Stuart kings, was the youngest on of a very large Irish family. His father Sir Villiam was a member of one of the houses of the ale. Here the Talbots established themselves as arly as the reign of Henry II., who in 1174 made to is follower Richard de Talbot a grant of Malahide, ear Dublin. According to Macaulay the Talbots ere "an old Irish family which had been long ettled in Leinster, which had there sunk into egeneracy, which had adopted the manners of the elts, which had, like the Celts, adhered to the old eligion, and which had taken part with the Celts in he rebellion of 1641." The family's long settlement n Leinster and its adherence to Roman Catholicism re not to be denied. Its share in the 1641 rebellion

may be left on one side for the present. With regard to the other two charges, it is to be wished that the historian had been more explicit. He cannot mean by degeneracy intermarriage with the native Irish, for of this there is no evidence. Sir William's wife was Alison, one of the Nettervilles of the Pale.* His father Robert Talbot married Catherine Lutterell, also from the Pale. Further back in the pedigree we find Thomas Talbot, of Malahide Castle, son of Sir Richard Talbot and Maud Plunkett, taking to wife Elizabeth Buckley. Norman blood ran very strongly in the veins of the Irish Talbots, and it is not until we come to one of Sir William's daughters that we have proof of an alliance with one of the "O's and Mac's," Eleanor Talbot marrying Sir Henry O'Neil. Macaulay himself, it may be noted, states—upon the authority of the *Sheridan Manuscript* at Windsor—that Tyrconnel "sometimes, in his rants, talked with Norman haughtiness of the Celtic barbarians."

But perhaps by "degeneracy" is intended much the same as "adoption of the manners of the Celt." As exhibited by William Talbot, these manners do not seem to have attracted unfavourable comment from his contemporaries, or we should undoubtedly have had it handed down to us by the countless enemies

* In a list of nobles and gentlemen of the Pale who, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, had complained of the "cess" as contrary to law and justice and refused to subscribe, we find side by side the names of William Talbot and John Newtervile (*sic*), who on February 7th, 1578, were fined £100 and £75 respectively. (*H.M.C. Reports, Egmont MSS.*, Vol. I.)

of his son Richard. His career was honourable, if chequered. Carte, biographer of the Duke of Ormonde who was so often at variance with the son, describes the father as "a lawyer and a man of good parts, who by his prudence and management had acquired a large estate." Talbot achieved rapid success in his profession and became Recorder of Dublin. His religion, however, brought him into trouble by preventing him from taking the oath of supremacy which was asked of him in the first year of James I., and he was removed from his post as a recusant. Turning his attention to politics, in 1613 he was elected for County Kildare in the Irish House of Commons. Again he was doomed to suffer for his religious views. He took a prominent part in the protests of the Opposition when James's first and only Irish Parliament met at Dublin Castle in May; and when the leading Roman Catholics resolved to complain to the King of the way in which their voice was stifled by the corrupt practices and oppression of their enemies they chose Talbot as one of the deputation to proceed to London. The Privy Council gave him a very unfriendly reception, tendered for his acceptance the English oath of supremacy, and invited his opinion on the doctrines of the Jesuit writer Suarez about the lawfulness of killing or deposing a heretic king. The legal abilities which those who had sent him over to England had hoped would be of such advantage to their cause could not preserve

him from the consequences of his religious scruples. He would not declare the deposition of a heretic king unlawful, though repudiating murder. He was accordingly committed to the Tower until it should be decided how to punish him.

In a communication which Talbot made to a fellow-prisoner, he did not mention his religion as the cause of his persecution.* Yet clearly it was what chiefly influenced his case. He appeared before the Star Chamber and was prosecuted by Francis Bacon, then Attorney-General. Still refusing the oath and declaring that matters of faith were for the Church to decide, he vainly acknowledged James as lawful and undoubted King, to whom he would bear true faith and allegiance during his own life. On November 13th the Star Chamber, after listening to the Attorney-General's vigorous denunciation of Talbot's attitude, delivered its verdict and adjudged that he should pay the monstrous fine of ten thousand pounds. In the meantime he returned to the Tower, to "attend on His Majesty's pleasure."

Happily for William Talbot, the injustice with

* Talbot told John Cotton that "he thought the cause of his trouble was because he was sent with others out of Ireland upon complaint of matters of that country, whereunto he said he was hardly drawn, and against his will." (*H.M.C. Reports, Ancaster MSS.*) In the funeral oration on the Duke of Tyrconnel in 1692, Messire A. Anselm says of William Talbot: "His intrepid wisdom made him so formidable to the ministers that their cruel policy condemned him to prison for several years, for the sole reason, they said, that it would never be possible to subdue Ireland while she had such a defender." Very probably it was the tradition in the family that William Talbot suffered rather as an Irish patriot than as a Roman Catholic.

which he was treated was not carried to an extremity. After more than a year in the Tower, he was permitted to return home in 1614, and it does not appear that payment of the fine was exacted. Without changing his faith, moreover, he obtained pardon for his offences, whatever they were. It has been suggested that the price of his forgiveness was that he should no longer act against the Government, and it is true that we do not hear of his doing so after his release. In February, 1622, he was honoured with a baronetcy, and subsequently he received gifts of land in Ireland, so that on his death on March 16th, 1633, he left a considerable estate to his heirs.

Sir William and his wife had in all sixteen children, eight sons and eight daughters.* The daughters do not figure prominently in history, although the eldest, Mary, by her marriage with Sir John Dongan, or Dungan, became the mother of some well-known personages at the Courts of Charles II. and James II. Of the sons we shall, in the course of this book, meet five others besides Richard. The eldest, Robert, who at the age of twenty-six, succeeded his father as second baronet, is described by Lord Chancellor Clarendon as "much the best; that is, the rest were much worse men"—not high praise, perhaps it may be said, except as coming from the pen of one who admits that he was looked upon as an enemy of the whole family. However, Carte, little more inclined

* For the complete list of the family, see Appendix B.

than Clarendon to extol one of the Talbots, allows him to have been "a gentleman of very good sense, strict honour, and great bravery."

Of John, who was probably the second son, we shall hear but little; of Garrett and James less still. But Peter, whom Clarendon calls the second of the brothers,* played no small part in intrigues both before and after the Restoration, while Gilbert and Thomas, the black sheep of the family, both made themselves conspicuous for a time during the long exile of Charles II.

Richard, if the commonly accepted date of his birth in 1630 be correct, was not more than three years old when his father died. In the family home at Carton or Cartown, Kildare, now the property of his brother Robert, his early years were passed; and here presumably he was, at the age of eleven, when the Irish insurrection under Owen O'Neil broke out. Through his tender years he took no immediate part in this rising against the English Government. But his family, like so many others belonging to the Pale, was soon drawn into it. As early as 1611 Lord Carew, sent by James I. to Ireland on a special mission of inspection, had the wisdom to foresee a drawing together, through community of faith, of the old English settlers and the native Irish, and prophesied that they would rebel "under the veil of religion and liberty." Thirty years later his forecast

* The second of those known to himself, Clarendon must mean.

proved true. The Roman Catholic invaders from Ulster, on entering the Pale in December, 1641, called on the inhabitants to join those who had the same interests as themselves and suffered the same injustices. The plea prevailed, and the Anglo-Norman Papists, including Sir Robert Talbot, ranged themselves on the side of the insurgents. But it must be stated that all intention of rebelling against the King was from the first repudiated. The very Ulstermen claimed to be supporters of the royal prerogative, on which the "malignants" in the English Parliament had encroached, and the nobles and gentry of the Pale looked upon themselves, not the officials at Dublin Castle, as the loyalists. In spite of Charles's hostile proclamation of January 1st, 1642, the celebrated Confederation began its career with a protest that it was making war on behalf of religion and the King.

Sir Robert Talbot quickly came to the front among the Confederates, as an eloquent advocate of their cause rather than as a fighting man. Indeed, in the warfare against the Marquis of Ormonde, either before or after he was made Lord Lieutenant, Sir Robert appears to have taken no part.* But he was prominent in council. He was one of the Irish

* Carte says: "Sir Robert . . . . having been driven by the lords justices' treatment unwillingly into the rebellion, and retaining always a true affection to his country, and good inclinations to the King's service, had constantly laboured to dispose his countrymen to peace, and persuade them to submission to His Majesty's authority. He was very active in promoting this end, whenever an opportunity offered." (*History of the Duke of Ormond*, IV., 67.)

representatives selected to present their grievances at the conference at Trim in March, 1643. He was, with Ormonde's brother-in-law Viscount Muskerry, one of the ten who signed the articles with Ormonde for the "Cessation" on September 15th, securing a year's truce. Next month he and Muskerry were also members of the commission of seven sent over to the King at Oxford. The Confederates' demands, including relief from the penal laws against Roman Catholics and freedom of the Irish Parliament from English interference, were more than Charles dared grant, had he wished to do so. The question of terms being referred to Ormonde, now Lord Lieutenant, Talbot was one of the twelve negotiators appointed by the Irish to meet him.

But the struggle was becoming at once more bitter and more complicated. The early barbarities of the Ulstermen against the settlers (in which the inhabitants of the Pale were in no way implicated) led to brutal reprisals, and to an order by the English Parliament that no quarter should be given to any Irish taken in arms. The dissensions in England, however, made for the advantage of those who had been proclaimed rebels across St. George's Channel. The Irish had already been soliciting aid from foreign nations, and the arrival of the Papal nuncio Giovanni Battista Rinuccini, armed with vast powers from Rome, rendered the chances of reconciliation with the dominant party in England much poorer. But the

King could not afford to be exacting. In his desperate plight at home he was anxious to gain Irish support, and Ormonde was commanded to conclude peace on the best terms which he could get. The result was the treaty of 1646, one of the signatories to which was Sir Robert Talbot. This treaty did not end the warfare, except as between the Lord Lieutenant and the leaders of the Pale. The fighting between the Irish and the troops of the English Parliament continued, while on the Confederate side the Papal nuncio and the clerical party in general denounced the peace with Ormonde. In vain the Lord Lieutenant endeavoured to gain over Owen O'Neil. Rinuccini's influence was too strong. Ormonde, after having been welcomed at Kilkenny, the Confederate headquarters, was driven back to Dublin, while Rinuccini deposed and for a time imprisoned the old Supreme Council. So hopeless did Ormonde's position become that he surrendered Dublin to the forces of the English Parliament and at the end of July, 1647, retired from Ireland for fourteen months.

It was little more than a week after Ormonde's departure that the youngest of the Talbot brothers is first heard of in the Confederate ranks. Aged now about seventeen, Richard was serving as a cornet of horse in the army of Thomas Preston, who disputed with Owen O'Neil the command of the Irish, and like him had been placed by Rinuccini on the new

Supreme Council. Carte says that Sir Robert Talbot's "prudence, credit and influence first brought his youngest brother into the world, where the favour and eminent worth of their sister's son, Sir Walter Dungan, contributed to advance him." Mary Talbot, eldest daughter of Sir William Talbot, as has been said, had married Sir John Dongan, and several of their sons served in the Confederate army with their father. The most prominent of these was Walter Dongan, the first-born, in whose troop Richard Talbot—his junior, though his uncle—was "standard-bearer." According to Carte, Walter Dongan came to Ormonde in 1645 with letters from King Charles recommending the extraordinary services of himself and his father and was given a commission to raise men and join Preston, who was better inclined than O'Neil to the King's side, and whose rather hesitating loyalty was hereafter to be rewarded by Charles II. with the title of Viscount Tara. After the treaty of 1646 and its rejection by the Irish clericals, Dongan sent to Ormonde to ask what he should do and was commanded to remain with Preston's army in hopes of bringing it over to the King.

Accordingly Dongan and his young uncle were with Preston at the beginning of August, 1647, when Colonel Michael Jones, the Irish Protestant, marched against him at the head of a Parliamentary force. On the 8th of the month the battle known by the name of Dungan Hill took place, the Confederates

being utterly routed, with a loss of five or six thousand men. As was usual in this ghastly struggle, little mercy was shown after victory, and perhaps it was only owing to his youth that Richard Talbot's life was spared, though he was taken prisoner. Whether he was released or exchanged or, as frequently afterwards, managed to make his escape, does not appear. At any rate, he was able before long to rejoin the army and to fight once more against the Parliamentarians.

Ormonde, on his return to Ireland in the autumn of 1648, found the split in the Confederate party much more pronounced than when he left, and he was heartily welcomed to Kilkenny by the General Assembly. Already O'Neil had been proclaimed a traitor by his former friends for treating with Jones for peace. The families of the Pale, true to their professions of loyalty to the King, would have no dealings with the Parliament.

In spite of all Rinuccini's efforts, the Confederates concluded another treaty with the Lord Lieutenant on January 17th, 1649, the terms being almost the same as those of the treaty of 1646. The murder of Charles I. only helped to cement the alliance; and Rinuccini, unable to procure the money he required from Rome and having completely lost his influence over the more solid of the Irish leaders, gave up the struggle and left Ireland, while Ormonde proclaimed Charles II. king.

The Parliamentarians replied vigorously. Denouncing Ormonde's allies once more as rebels and repudiating all treaties with them, they patched up a kind of truce with O'Neil and even supplied his forces with gunpowder and provisions. Moreover, Cromwell himself landed at Dublin with the title of Lord Lieutenant on August 15th, and took the field at once. The first place which he attacked was Drogheda, where Ormonde had put Sir Arthur Aston in command and where Richard Talbot was among the garrison. The siege began on September 3rd, but Cromwell's big guns were not in position until the 10th. As soon as the bombardment began, however, all was over. The besieged were hopelessly outnumbered, and their gallant resistance could not survive the assault next day. A massacre followed, the extent of which is disputed, although it is admitted by the victors to have gone on for two days, and to have included many non-combatants. Cromwell, on his own confession, ordered no quarter to be given to any found in arms, and the escape of Richard Talbot was almost miraculous. Seriously wounded and thought to be dead, he owed his preservation, amid the general butchery, to the compassion of Commissary-General John Reynolds. But for his luck in falling into the hands of a merciful man, his chance of life would indeed have been small, since, apart from the general refusal of quarter, the "old English" were if possible even

more obnoxious to the Parliamentarians than were the native Irish.

In the dress of a woman—the disguise must have been good for this tall young Irishman to pass as such—Richard Talbot made his way into safety. The Irish and Royalist cause was lost, although the struggle still continued for a while and Talbot's kinsmen still played various parts in it. Ormonde had been making unceasing efforts to gain over Owen O'Neil to his side. Charles II., to assist him in the attempt, sent over from Saint-Germain a letter to O'Neil, entrusting it to Father Thomas, one of the two Talbot brothers who had chosen the church for their career. Ormonde despatched Thomas Talbot to O'Neil, and at last in October a treaty was made. But it was too late. O'Neil was very ill and died only a fortnight after he had agreed to act as Ormonde's representative in Ulster.

Town after town fell into the hands of the Parliamentarians. Ormonde was unable to save even Kilkenny, and Cromwell was so satisfied with the progress of affairs that at the end of May, 1650, he put the command into the hands of Ireton and quitted Ireland. The new general carried on the work vigorously. At Tecroghan in Meath he found Sir Robert Talbot in charge of the castle. The siege was entrusted to Reynolds, Richard's preserver. Sir Robert held out over a month and only capitulated on June 25th on condition that he and the garrison

should go free. Dissensions among the Irish led to talk of treachery, but Ormonde refused to believe it against an honourable man, and doubtless he was justified in his confidence.* The Irish extremists had grown proportionately stronger as the Royalists went on from defeat to defeat, and unhappily they hesitated at little that would damage those who were nominally fighting the same enemies as themselves. Ormonde himself soon suffered at their hands. He quarrelled with the Roman Catholic bishops, who now after O'Neil's death had the strongest hold over the native Irish, and they excommunicated all who followed him. Charles's miserable submission to the Scots' demands and consequent denunciation of the Irish as rebels completed the breach. Very naturally the Irish Roman Catholics, for their own safety, demanded a Lord Lieutenant of their faith. Ormonde was forced to yield, though he managed to persuade the Irish to accept Lord Clanricarde with the title of his "deputy." Having obtained this concession, he sailed from Dublin for the French coast on December 11th, not to revisit Ireland for nearly twelve years.

The Irish prolonged the hopeless contest for another two years after Ormonde's retirement, but

* It may be noted that when Athlone Castle fell a year later, Talbot's enemies revived their accusations against him. But Lord Muskerry, writing to Ormonde on August 25th, 1651, though speaking of "the treacherous surrender of the castle of Athlone," declined to hold Sir Robert guilty. (*H.M.C. Reports, Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. I., New Series.)

they could scarcely any longer be said to have been upholding the King's cause. There were Royalists among them still in the field, such as Sir Robert Talbot and the Dongans. Of the latter Carte says that Walter, with his brother William and his father Sir John, took Ormonde's advice "to make themselves as considerable as possible among the Irish and keep an interest among them until his own return to Ireland." "They were all valiant, active, and faithful," he continues. "Sir Walter was wounded and taken prisoner in the service; but after being released and appointed commissary-general of the horse, he held out against the usurper, till enforced with the rest of his party to transport himself according to articles to Spain, where he gave signal testimonies of his duty, affection, and loyalty to His Majesty's service."

Considerable (it may seem excessive) space has been given here to the Irish Rebellion and to the part played therein by the kinsmen and connections of Richard Talbot. But it is impossible to understand the future attitude of Tyrconnel towards the politics of his day without seeing what were the influences which worked upon him in boyhood and youth and moulded his opinions. We have found him brought up among a class of men with high aristocratic traditions, who tried to solve the terribly difficult problem how to remain loyal at once to the religion of their ancestors, to the land of their birth, and to

the King of whose right to the throne they had no doubt. The Talbots, like so many others of the Pale, were staunch to their church, but possessed too much independence of mind to accept the extreme papal claims. Rinuccini met with no acquiescence from Sir Robert when he endeavoured to make him bow with the Celtic Irish to the unlimited authority with which he had been entrusted by Rome. In 1687 Tyrconnel may seem, if we accept a certain document as good evidence, to have abandoned the principles for which the Roman Catholics of the Pale strove. But it will be shown that this document does not merit the importance which has been attached to it.

With regard to their patriotism, the Talbots never ceased to uphold what they considered to be the rights of Ireland. That they, with their pride of another race, should not have been able to satisfy the Celts as to their whole-heartedness is not surprising if we consider how long the wall of exclusion had stood round the Pale, how slowly the "old English," as they were so often called, admitted an admixture of native blood into their families. The descendants of the former invaders, nevertheless, clung to the land of their birth with a devotion which has been paralleled by that of later invaders of Ireland. They had no wish to return whence they came. Nor have the Protestant Ulstermen of to-day, it seems. But the inhabitants of the Pale had the additional reason for desiring to remain where they were, in that

James II. was not the first to dream that Ireland might be a safe asylum for Roman Catholics when circumstances should render it impossible for them to live elsewhere in the Three Kingdoms. The Talbots and others had remained Roman Catholics partly because they were born Irish. They wished to remain Irish because they were born Roman Catholics.

Naturally their faith and their love of country hung together. The struggle was to combine the two with their loyalty to their King when that King persecuted their faith and misgoverned their country. But they had an ingrained attachment to the Crown, which their conquered Celtic neighbours could not be expected to share. Such a sentiment is impossible to analyse. It may be either laughed at, pitied, or admired. In any case, it must be accepted as a fact. Sir William Talbot's sons, it might be thought, could look back with little gratitude on the memory of James I. Adherence to Charles I. brought nothing but disaster to Sir Robert. Charles II. at Dunfermline in August, 1650, at the dictation of the Scots, classed all implicated in the rising as "bloody Irish rebels, who treacherously shed the blood of so many of his faithful and loyal subjects." No exception was made in favour of the Pale. But the Talbots could make a distinction between the King and his acts, and hold unwavering to their allegiance in the midst of their sufferings. Branded as rebels, they upheld the royal prerogative. Of them Tyrconnel had the best reason

for thankfulness to the master whom in particular he served. It might have been expected, therefore—since the study of political history encourages cynicism—that he would have proved ungrateful. He did not. But the cynics may be satisfied, for his lot in consequence has been to be branded with ignominy.

In vindicating Tyrconnel's character from unjust charges it is not necessary to deny that there were some serious stains on his record. To one of these, which is far more grave in modern estimation than it was in that of his contemporaries, we are now coming.

CHAPTER II

A PLOT AGAINST CROMWELL

AT the age of nineteen Richard Talbot had already taken his share in two of the greatest disasters, one a pitched battle, the other the storming of a stronghold, which befell the enemies of the English Parliamentary party in Ireland. Following the fortunes of Walter Dongan, he had been once made prisoner and once left for dead. With nothing more than his life he had succeeded in escaping from his native land, having before him no better prospects than those of a soldier of fortune. A period of obscurity follows his departure from Ireland. The next news heard of him is that in March, 1653, he is in Madrid holding the rank of captain and in the company of his nephew. Walter Dongan, we have seen, continued the struggle in Ireland until the treaty of 1652 compelled him to leave. He then entered the Spanish military service, like so many of his exiled fellow-countrymen. Richard, before they met again,

seems to have been in the company of his brother Peter. Indeed they may have left Ireland together.

Peter Talbot, had he not been a natural intriguer, little troubled with scruples, might have come down to history as a martyr; for he was destined to die as Archbishop of Dublin, a prisoner in the Castle for pretended complicity in the "Popish plot," and suffering from an agonizing disease. He was about ten years older than his brother Richard, and had been sent to a Jesuit college in Portugal at the age of fifteen. From Portugal he went to Rome, from Rome to Antwerp to lecture on moral theology, and from Antwerp back to Portugal. When he returned to Ireland he was already an accomplished and subtle man. With the other Jesuits, he did not bow to the claims of the nuncio Rinuccini, but endeavoured to keep the peace with the Viceroy—though, it is clear, never at any time succeeding in inspiring Ormonde with confidence in him. After the ruin of the royalist cause he appeared in Madrid, and we find from a still-surviving letter of his in Latin that he and a brother, whom we may suppose to be Richard, had reason to thank one of the Irish bishops then residing there for good offices done to them.*

* Peter Talbot to the Bishop of Clonmacnoise, Antwerp, July 3rd, 1654, quoted in Cardinal Moran's *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, II., p. 133. On his mission to London the Jesuit was no doubt protected by his diplomatic quality; but, proceeding from England to Ireland on a political scheme of his own imagining, he tells the bishop that he "underwent the same danger as others." By the Act of July, 1650, rewards had been offered for the discovery of priests or Jesuits as for highwaymen.

Peter Talbot left Madrid for London on a mission from the King of Spain to his Ambassador in England, while Richard, who had perhaps already joined the Spanish ranks, remained behind.

Spain, glad as she was to welcome the Irish exiles into her army to aid her in the struggle with France, was in no position to keep her promises to the new recruits. Soldiers of fortune expect something besides the mere opportunity of fighting. Now the Irish regiments under the Spanish flag got as much fighting as they could want, but little or no pay or food. The breach of faith quickly aroused discontent among the Irish. And there was another reason which increased the discontent of those of them who were loyal adherents of the Stuarts. In 1652 the young Duke of York had obtained permission to serve as a volunteer in the French army under the Vicomte de Turenne. When the exiles saw him an officer in the opposing ranks they were disgusted with their own position, and some of them were not slow to translate their desires into action. Foremost was Thomas, Viscount Dillon of Costello, colonel of an Irish regiment in the Spanish forces under the Prince of Condé. He set the example, which was rapidly followed by numbers of his compatriots, of going over with his men to the French side, and soon the Duke of York had a fine body of auxiliaries to place at the disposal of his hosts.

It does not appear that Richard Talbot was one of

those who early deserted the Spanish for the French army. Walter Dongan remained in the ranks of Spain, and his uncle may have done so too. Events came to pass which not only tempered any enthusiasm that royalist exiles might feel for France, but even converted the French government into the chief obstacle, on the continent of Europe, to the restoration of the Stuarts. The all-powerful Mazarin's policy of friendship with Cromwell involved a French refusal of asylum to Charles II. In July, 1654, the unfortunate King was obliged to seek for a new shelter. His pension from France was no longer to be paid to him direct, and in any case was precarious henceforward in view of the desire to please Cromwell. To hasten his departure Mazarin paid up the arrears—for payment was always much behind the time—on condition of secrecy; and with a sum totally inadequate to meet the needs of himself and his immediate followers on their travels, Charles wandered about in search of a spot secure from the reach of the Protector's enmity. Debarred, through the fear of England, from French, Spanish and Dutch territory, and despised by the Vatican as a heretic, he had only the German Empire left to him; and even Ferdinand was in no wise prepared to do more than tolerate his presence in his dominions as a private individual, promise a grant (at some future date) for his personal maintenance, and allow collections to be made from the princes of the Empire.

On such charity as he could beg from various sources Charles was compelled to subsist and to keep up his semblance of a household. In the winter following his removal from France, after a season spent at Spa with his widowed sister Mary of Orange, Princess Royal of England, he took up his abode at Cologne, the city which offered him the kindest welcome and provided him with at least the bare necessities of life gratis, though its Bishop-Elector persisted in rudely ignoring him.

Cologne now became the centre of the royalist plots about which so much information is preserved in the collections of documents known by the names of the Clarendon, Thurloe and Nicholas Papers. Innumerably more schemes were planned than ever saw the light of day; but, roughly, they were all of two kinds. There was the plot for a rising against the Commonwealth in various parts of the three kingdoms, combined with or preparatory to a landing of the King. And there was the plot to assassinate Cromwell. Often the two were carried on side by side; for, to the Royalist, at least, there was no point in removing Cromwell unless it were to make way for the restoration of King Charles. The co-operation of such people as the "Levellers," for instance, who hated Cromwell not as a regicide but as a tyrant, was not rejected, but difficulties always arose when the non-monarchical conspirators began to suggest terms. The thorough loyalists would consent

to no imposition of limitations upon the King. It was this obstacle which doomed to failure the strenuous efforts of Peter Talbot, who was convinced that Charles could best be restored by the joint aid of Spain and the Levellers. When Edward Sexby, the most influential man among the latter, made his escape to Antwerp from the hands of Cromwell in May, 1655, he and Peter Talbot at once set to work to find a basis of agreement. But the Jesuit never succeeded in convincing his fellow-exiles that an alliance with the Levellers might be secured which would not compromise the authority of the King.

The necessary condition for the success of plots of either kind was secrecy—particularly, of course, for the success of an assassination plot. And this condition was never secured, owing to the network of spies which Cromwell was able to spread about his enemies in every quarter, at home and abroad. Never was the truth of the maxim "Fore-warned is fore-armed" better appreciated by anyone than by the Protector, and thanks to his command of money he bought for himself the warnings which the poverty-stricken Royalists in vain tried to keep from his ears. Like other men of iron, he well knew the power of gold. His intelligence in preventing dangers to his government and himself often appears superhuman, yet can always be traced to the adroit use of cash placed in the right hands. Many engagers in conspiracy against him were brought to

realise this bitterly, and Richard Talbot very nearly found himself among the company of those who paid with their lives for a failure which their intended victim had purchased with money—escaping by a miracle which seems as remarkable as Cromwell's own constant escapes from the death which threatened him.

According to Clarendon's *Continuation*, young Talbot was brought by Daniel O'Neil* to Flanders—it should be to Cologne—"as one who was willing to assassinate Cromwell." Since his presence in Madrid with Sir Walter Dongan in March, 1653, until his appearance now, Talbot is lost to sight in the records of the royalist exiles. That he did in 1655 take part in a plot to end the Protector's life we have abundant evidence apart from what Clarendon says. As to his introduction for that purpose by his countryman O'Neil we have no confirmation, and the deduction which has been made from the Chancellor's statement that he went to England with the King's sanction of the assassination scheme is unwarranted in itself and unsupported by surviving documents of the period. There is evidence, on the contrary, that Charles lent no countenance to such schemes. "Manie are for assassinating the Protector," Thurloe

* Colonel Daniel O'Neil (nephew of the celebrated Owen O'Neil, though a Protestant) was one of Charles's leading supporters in exile, a gentleman of his bedchamber, and a busy promoter of plots for risings against the Commonwealth. He was one of the seventeen Royalists expressly excluded from France with the King and the two Royal Dukes by Cromwell's treaty with Mazarin in November, 1655. O'Neil was afterwards the third husband of Catherine, Lady Stanhope, mother of the second Lord Chesterfield.

was informed by his spy Manning in May, 1655, "but Ch[arles] St[ewart] is not forward in having it don." And from the letters of Sir Edward Nicholas to Thomas Ross, the royalist agent, in February, 1656, it is clear that Charles's Secretary of State made a point of keeping him in ignorance of a similar plot which Richard Hopton wished to get up that year. The ardent servants of the King had no scruples of conscience against the idea themselves. Nicholas, a man with a most honourable record, could talk of Hopton's suggestion as "so glorious a work" and "so charitable a deed." Other very prominent Royalists were at least familiar with the idea, as is proved by the frequent mention of it in letters received by them, and did not feel called upon to repudiate it. But the King himself, as indeed we might expect from the general humanity and unvindictiveness of his character, is nowhere shown to have given his approval to attempts on Cromwell's life. His enemies endeavoured to implicate him by means of a forged Royal Proclamation of May 3rd, 1654, but there is no trace of this document beyond an alleged copy supplied by a spy of Thurloe; and to the spy the temptation to make "revelations" was as irresistible as it is to the modern sensational journalist. The King of course knew that there were conspiracies against the life of the usurper, just as the latter knew of schemes against the life of the King. To admit this, however, is very different from saying

that either directly plotted the other's death. But it must be remembered that, after the battle of Worcester, Cromwell at least had set the price of a thousand pounds on Charles's head and threatened with death any who should venture to conceal him in his flight.

The King was privy, no doubt, to part of the plot with which we are now dealing. James Halsall, the chief agent in it, was commissioned to raise money from royalist supporters in England, some of which was to be spent on the purchase of horses in view of a Scottish insurrection against Cromwell at the beginning of 1656. And Richard Talbot, like his brother Peter, is credited with hopes of setting on foot a similar insurrection in Ireland, though it cannot be said for certain that he actually entertained the idea at the time of his visit to England in the summer of 1655. Anyhow, it is clear enough that Cromwell's assassination was but a portion, if the most urgent portion, of a wider plan to upset the government established in London.*

The year of the enterprise in which Richard Talbot took his share was a very busy one with the royalist conspirators. 1654 had been full of disappointment

* The English government recognised this. A paragraph, apparently official, in a news-letter of December 11th, 1655, says: "Wee are yett in the examination of the late designe of Halsall and others, and have in custody and in our power five of those who were particularly designed to assassinate my Lord Protector, and other [*sc.* schemes] there are which depended on this, but this to bee done in the first place, as that which was so necessary, as all would miscarry without itt." (*Clarke Papers*, III., 61.)

for them. Early in that year the first scheme concocted by the committee in England known as the Sealed Knot was a complete fiasco. Another attempt was delayed first by the discovery of Henshaw's assassination plot against the Protector and then by the detection of plans of the Levellers and other republican malcontents. A general uprising of Royalists was nevertheless arranged for January and postponed until February 13th (old style), 1655; but divided counsels and dilatory tactics caused the day to pass without a stir, and so the government had time to get on its guard and prevent immediate action. Undeterred by these failures, the English monarchists fixed March 8/18th as the day for another attempt, and in spite of the miscarriage of plans elsewhere the West Country actually broke out into insurrection, though three days after the appointed date—with fatal results to many. An anonymous letter from England, dated February 19th (old style), preserved among the Clarendon Papers, says that "any wise man might have foreseen the ruin of this business, from the buying of arms and ammunition in London and the communication of the design to a large number of persons, many mean in parts and condition, and many mad and drunk."

The failure of the Spring Rising of 1655, although it led to much recrimination among the Royalists, did not check even temporarily the hatching of schemes against the Protector and his government. But the

severities inflicted on the King's friends for their recent attempt led to the increase of assassination plots rather than of plots for further insurrections. Cromwell acted with great vigour after the executions in the West of England, beginning with those of Colonels Penruddock and Grove, with eight others, at Exeter on May 16th. The end of May and the whole of June saw constant arrests of leaders of the beaten party in London. By an order of July 6th all adherents of either Charles II. or his father were banished from the capital. In August the entire country was parcelled out into districts, each under the control of a Major-General with extraordinary authority to maintain the peace. These "Bashaws," as they were nicknamed, had powers of life and death over the Protector's enemies. Cromwell's treaty with France on November 3rd, 1655 (which stipulated, among other things, for the exclusion of Charles, his two brothers, and seventeen of his chief supporters from French territory), was followed by edicts disarming the Royalists and imposing a ten per cent. tax on their estates.

The disarmament order in particular aroused among the Cavaliers bitter fears of a general massacre. But already yet another desperate plan to remove the tyrant out of the way had been set on foot and had failed. When this conspiracy took its rise is not certain. As early as February 6/16th one of Thurloe's spies at Cologne, Sir John Henderson, informed him

that he was assured by Massonet, a treacherous secretary of Charles II., of designs against the Protector's person, though he could not learn particulars. On May 15/25th a certain Richard Hannam, under examination in London, gave particulars of a plot which is certainly not that in which Talbot was involved. In the same month the Duke of York wrote to his brother from Paris, mentioning a plan which had been proposed to him by "fower Roman Catholiks that have bound themselves in a sollemn oath to kill Cromwell and then to raise all the Catholiks in the citty and the army." But this, again, is not the plot of Talbot and his companions, for the details do not agree.

Well posted as was Cromwell as to designs against himself, he was quite unable to prevent royalist agents, even when credited with such designs, from making their way into England from abroad. They came in, indeed, with surprising facility, and, if they did not accomplish anything, at least they avoided capture. The spies on the Continent attributed this ease of entry to the connivance of a secretly pro-royalist official at Dover. But Cromwell's tyranny had made many careless in his interests who were yet in no way inclined to the King. Nothing shows this more plainly than the whole story of the conspiracy in which Talbot was involved.

The beginning of this plot, or at least of the attempt to put it into execution, may be seen in the

departure from Cologne in early July, 1655, of a certain James Halsall or Halsey, described by Manning to Thurloe as "a little black man," "about 35 years of age, round face, in short hair or a periwig, and a round man;" and, again, as "one of our chiefest agents." Halsall, whom we find a member of Charles's household at Cologne in 1655, had been prominently engaged in the arrangements for the Northern section of the Spring Rising and was among the lucky ones who escaped over sea after a period of hiding in London. He now started on another and still more dangerous errand, yet so full of confidence that he borrowed a pistol from Lord Gerard, one of Charles's household, saying he would pay a hundred pounds for it unless the Protector were killed in three months' time. In the journey to England he was preceded by Colonel John Stephens, who had also taken part in the Spring Rising and had escaped, and by Richard Rose, servant to Lord Rochester. He was followed by "one Captain Talbot, a tall young man and an Irish," as Manning describes him in a letter to Thurloe, and by Robert Dongan.

The last-named—who frequently appears in letters of the period as "Robin" Dongan, which, as in the case of "Dick" Talbot, argues that he was familiarly known among the royalist exiles—was one of the younger members of the family of Sir John Dongan and Mary Talbot. He had been page to the Marquis of Ormonde and more recently had accompanied as

second-in-command that romantic cavalier Edward Wogan on the desperate enterprise into Scotland which ended in his death in January, 1654. We know little of Robert Dongan beyond what is mentioned in the following pages, save that he is the "Duncan" of the *Memoirs of Gramont*. On the whole he appears to have been a rather unpleasant character.

All five conspirators made their way safely into England by way of Dover. Proof of the danger which they ran was quick in coming, however, Stephens and Talbot being arrested on suspicion after their arrival in London.* Stephens was soon at liberty again, and about the middle of September left England for Dunkirk, where he fell seriously ill. Nothing incriminating can have been found upon him or Talbot, for the latter also obtained his release; though it would appear that he was not, as is usually stated, set free at the same time as Stephens. When we consider what efforts the spies at Cologne had made to secure their arrest and the precise information which they had supplied about them, it is difficult to understand how either of them got off without at least a long term of imprisonment; unless it was that, in order to discover Halsall, his colleagues were released to act as unconscious decoys.

* Perhaps the earliest allusion to their arrest is to be found in an intelligence-letter to Thurloe dated Cologne, July 28th (new style), 1655. Speaking of a journey of Lord Gerard to France, the spy writes: "If you sent somebody to observe his actions you would do well; for hearing Talbot, Stephens, &c., to be taken, he intends to attempt the murther of the Protector," (*Thurloe State Papers*, III., 659.)

After his fortunate escape from punishment, Talbot went to Halsall, who had remained successfully hidden in lodgings in London, attended by a confidential servant, William Masten—in whom he trusted, as he says himself, "to the letting him know all his business"—and urged him to take some action at once. But Halsall hung back; and he was supported from headquarters at Cologne in his contention the present was a bad time for any attempt. Rose having dropped out of the plot and departed from England like Stephens, Halsall was left alone in it with the two young Irishmen, both eager for something to be done. From Talbot's letter to Ormonde after he had reached Brussels, and also from what he told George Lane, it seems that he made great efforts to persuade Halsall, meeting his argument that funds were lacking with an offer to pawn for £600 a lady's jewel worth £1,500. Halsall still put him off—notwithstanding his bet with Lord Gerard and much to Talbot's disgust—and so completed the ruin of the plot. Cromwell's agents had apparently been watching for their opportunity to strike, while the conspirators had been quite unaware that they were threatened by any special danger. On November 16th Halsall was outside the door of his London lodgings, in the company of a young man named Prescott, when he was made prisoner. His clothing was searched, and inside the lining of his hat were found compromising papers, including his cipher, with the names of a

number of prominent Royalists, and other evidences of his intrigues in England. Next day Talbot and Dongan were also seized. It might have been expected that all three would now pay the penalty for their failure with their lives. The surprising fact is that none of them suffered death.

Two traitors had contributed to the capture of the conspirators. One was William Masten, whose share in the betrayal included no doubt the revelation of the lodgings of his master and his friends. Halsall guessed who had played him false, but as a captive in Cromwell's hands had no means at the moment of putting the Royalists on their guard; so that the man was able to go on posing for a time as still loyal and anxious to carry out the assassination scheme,* while arranging with the Protector's government to entrap, if possible, other friends of his master. He was handsomely rewarded for his services. "He may well be full of gold," writes Halsall later, "for I am almost confident he had £2,000, if not more, for his service." Early in 1657, after having kept out of danger so long, Masten fell into Spanish hands, but seems to have avoided punishment by declaring that he was a Roman Catholic.

The other traitor was not so lucky. He was Henry Manning, one of the most contemptible of spies in

* Writing to Edward Halsall to inform him of the disaster which had overtaken his brother, Masten said: "I have a nopertunity once in the weeck that I may with ese kil the roge, therefore let me know what I shall do therin." The "roge" is, of course, Cromwell.

Cromwell's pay. Son and brother of royalist officers who had lost their lives in the Civil War and himself formerly in the King's army, Manning, being short of money—owing to his father's debts, according to his own account—allowed himself to be engaged by Colonel William Hawley to act as Thurloe's intelligencer at the Court of the exiled King. Soon after Charles's arrival in Cologne Manning had come with an introduction to Dr. Earle, one of the royal chaplains; and, being a man of good appearance and manners—"a proper young gentleman," says Clarendon—plausible and seemingly candid, he soon made his way into Court society at Cologne. He was further aided by that rarity at the Court, a well-filled purse, for his employers appear to have paid him £120 a month. With the assistance of his ready money he made for himself friends, especially among the more gay and indiscreet of the cavaliers, and from what he learnt through them and others he was able, from March, 1655, onward, to send to Thurloe in London important news of royalist visits to England. He was responsible, in part at least, for the betrayal of the names of many of those implicated in the Spring Rising, and now again he betrayed Halsall, Talbot and Dongan. It was not his fault, as can be seen from his numerous letters to Thurloe, that those concerned in this assassination plot were not all seized at the beginning. But while Manning was contriving their ruin, someone else was doing the same for him.

Eighteen days after Talbot and Dongan were taken in London, Manning was arrested in Cologne. According to a letter written to Sir Edward Nicholas by a Colonel Whitley, royalist agent at Calais, the discovery of Manning's guilt was fathered in England upon Don Alonso de Cardenas, Spanish Ambassador to the Protector. Don Alonso had been "extreamly slighted by Cromwell"; and, having been recalled from England when a definite breach was provoked by the Protector, after his arrival in Brussels on November 21st he told the Earl of Norwich all he knew as to the way in which Cromwell got his information about royalist movements and schemes. In consequence of what he said, some letters to Manning were watched for and intercepted at Antwerp, and on December 5th the spy himself was arrested in his lodgings at Cologne, at the very moment when he was writing a letter to Thurloe.

Abundant evidence was found in Manning's papers to prove him guilty, and his own admissions confirmed it, although he protested—what we know from the Thurloe papers to be untrue—that he had only sent trivial and misleading intelligence to England so as to get money to live upon, while his real desire was to serve the King. He underwent a searching examination by Lord Culpepper, the Marquis of Ormonde and Secretary Nicholas, and was apparently condemned to death by them. The last of his letters preserved in the *Nicholas Papers*, dated December 14th, 1655,

speaks of "sad rumoures of a suddein end intended me, nay, too morow morning," and begs Nicholas to intercede with the King on his behalf. He no longer makes any defence of his "horrid" and "too heynous" crime, but beseeches to be allowed to end his days in some cloister or dungeon. His prayers were without avail. Very soon after this letter was written, if not on the following morning, he was "pistolled" in a wood near Cologne by two of the King's household, Sir James Hamilton and Major Nicholas Armorer. An intercepted letter from a Cromwellian correspondent, dated Leyden, December 24th, states in a postscript that "a Dane just come from Cologne says that on passing through a wood two hours short of Cologne they found a young Englishman dead, who was said to be Manning." Although previous to his sentence Manning had been confined in the city prison, Maximilian Henry, Bishop-Elector of Cologne, strongly objected to the execution taking place in his territory, and the wretched man had therefore been conveyed to the wood, which was in the duchy of Juliers, the territory of the friendly Philip William, Count Palatine of Neuburg.

It cannot be said that Manning's fate was undeserved, whatever opinion may be held of the legality of his execution on foreign soil. If ever capital punishment be justifiable it was so in his case. He had brought the Cavalier victims to the scaffold at Exeter and elsewhere in May and did his best to put

other lives in jeopardy between July and November. In one of his "Statements" under examination at Cologne he contended that he did not know of anyone being arrested in England on his information, and that he only wrote about some whose names had already been suggested to him by his employers. He also tried to make out that it was only after Hawley had mentioned his suspicions that the brothers Halsall had come over to England to murder Cromwell that he had replied that one of the brothers was there as an agent of the King. With regard to Richard Talbot, all that is to be found in the records of Manning's examinations is the sentence: "In one letter I was desired to write if I knew anything of one Coll. Talbot's being employed hence, to which I could make no other answer than that I knew nothing more than he was one of my Lord Ormond's officers in the king of Spain's service."

As has been said, however, Manning's own letters prove the falsity of his protestations that he had sent but trivial and misleading information to England.*

* Doubtless he mixed up fact and fiction in an extraordinary manner. To quote only one letter, on November 17th—the very date of Talbot's and Dongan's arrest—Manning had written to Thurloe: "This I dare assure you, the main is to murder the Protector, and to seize such sea-ports in the nation as they find most feazible. Ormond and Hyde are the engines who drive on this design, to preserve themselves in play here. . . . They are confident of having something executed very suddenly; and Charles Stuart daily tells us in private, 'Have patience a little, and you will not fail of action, both in England and Scotland, or else adieu Ormond and Hyde!'" (*Thurloe State Papers*, IV., 169.) His method was to convey a certain amount of valuable intelligence, embellished by inventions of his own designed to magnify his own value—and increase his salary.

In one, which had been intercepted, he accused Ormonde, Hyde and Culpepper, who "rule the roaste," of "endeavouring the Protector's murther (the actors, most of them, I have often named), which is yet generally thought would be of much advantage to any action." Now the "actors" whom he had often named were, as we know, precisely the men who had fallen into Cromwell's hands.

On their arrest Halsall, Talbot and Dongan were taken to Whitehall, so that they might be examined by Cromwell himself. Halsall, as the chief of the conspiracy, was brought up first, on November 25th. His captured papers were very important, but they did not prove anything as to the assassination plot, and Halsall steadfastly asserted that his business in England was the collection of money on behalf of the King. This was true, if not the whole truth, for Halsall was entrusted with that task apart from his share in the other plot. He admitted that the money was partly to be devoted to equipping an insurrection in Scotland in a month or two, though he would not reveal the names of those implicated except in cases where he knew that they were out of reach.

Unable to get anything to the purpose from Halsall, Cromwell had Richard Talbot brought before him. He began the interview (according to the account furnished by Peter to a friend, Harding, in Cologne) with an attempt to win him over, offering "great

preferments," claiming that he himself was related to the Talbots of the Shrewsbury branch, and promising secrecy as to any confession which might be made. This having no effect, he asked suddenly why Talbot should think of killing him, seeing that he had never prejudiced him in his life. The other might have alluded to Drogheda, but did not. He contented himself with denying any knowledge of a plot. Cromwell produced the captured cipher, but, though it had the names of Dongan, Wogan, and others, Talbot's was not there. Cromwell pretended that Halsall, nevertheless, had betrayed it to him. If so, retorted Talbot, let Halsall be brought face to face with him. Cromwell told Thurloe to fetch him, but then, realising that this would lead to nothing, revoked the order and descended to threats of the rack. He would spin it out of Talbot's bones, he menaced. "Spin me to a thread if you please," was the answer, "I have nothing to confess, and can only invent lies"—whereon the baffled captor abandoned his efforts and commanded the prisoner to be taken away.

After he had been removed from Cromwell's presence, Richard Talbot was visited in his cell by both Lambert and Thurloe, the latter of whom (according to Peter Talbot) made him great offers of money, to which he replied that he only desired back his own £240, of which the soldiers had robbed him, doubtless "mistaking them for papers." Twenty

pounds was all that he was given by Thurloe, but of this he was able to make good use. He learnt that it was intended to take him from Whitehall to the Tower the next morning, and therefore thought it time to escape, as he wrote to Ormonde from Brussels on January 3rd. "That night," says Peter in the letter to Harding, "he bestowed much wine upon Cromwell's soldiers, who waited on him and served him like a Prince, slipped down to the Thames by a cord, where he had a boat prepared, and in that little thing was ten days at sea; landed at last at Callis [Calais], still nayled and shut up between some boards of the boate."

So ended Richard Talbot's second and last bout with Cromwell, decidedly more remarkable than the first. At Drogheda they had not met face to face, Talbot had been merely one of the many hundreds ruthlessly denied quarter by the conqueror; and he had escaped the sword merely because he was thought already dead. At Whitehall, Talbot, completely at the Protector's mercy, had defied his threats of torture and rescued himself from his jailers by bribing and intoxicating them. After Drogheda he had fled in the dress of a woman; from Whitehall he smuggled himself away boxed up in the bottom of a river-boat and so sailed across the Channel. No one else could boast that he had cheated Cromwell thus.

CHAPTER III

UNDER A CLOUD

AFTER his adventurous and uncomfortable voyage across the English Channel and arrival at Calais, Talbot made his way towards the royalist headquarters. On December 27th he reached Brussels and on January 3rd he was at Antwerp. Before leaving Brussels he wrote a letter to Lord Ormonde, in which he gave certain details about his examination by Cromwell and his flight from Whitehall. With regard to the failure of the plot he expressed himself confident that if Halsall should have the good luck to escape he would confess that it was not through him that "the business" was not attempted. As for Dongan and the rest that were prisoners—Prescott had been arrested for supposed complicity, and there was also a fifth, a friend of Halsall named Charles Davison, whom Masten had hastened to denounce to the authorities in London—there was no danger, if they themselves did not by their confessions destroy

one another. For when he came away, he added, Cromwell "had no other ground to proceed upon than bare suspitions, and consequently, for the safety of theyr lives, it's necessary that nothing be said of it."

Richard Talbot arrived in Antwerp in the company of his brothers Peter and Gilbert. There they met George Lane, Clerk of the Council to the King, who wrote to Ormonde enclosing Richard's Brussels letter and speaking of the satisfaction of Gilbert with Ormonde's friendship to his family. Gilbert, as will be seen, had reason to be particularly anxious for this friendship.

At Antwerp the brothers remained until they should be able to see Ormonde, to whom Peter wrote insistently on January 7th that he should come before a million crowns which had just arrived there should be distributed. While waiting, Richard received a letter signed "Donna Francisca," informing him that Robert Dongan had escaped. Donna Francisca was probably Lady Isabella Thynne, an ardent intriguer among the English Royalists,* who had by some means managed to rescue Dongan from his prison about the end of December or beginning of January. But Dongan himself had not yet succeeded in leaving England, and in the meanwhile

* Manning had written from Cologne in the April of the previous year mentioning "the ladies Thin and Shanon" as having their parts in a royalist plot, "to carry letters and goe up and down on errands." (*Thurloe State Papers*, III.)

his uncle Richard was unaware that a storm was hanging over his own head.

In the second week of January Ormonde arrived in Antwerp and found two of the three brothers very intent on their plans. Peter, as usual, was busy with a scheme to combine the Levellers in England with Spain on the Continent in restoring Charles to his throne. He was negotiating with Fuensaldanha, commander of the Spanish forces in the Netherlands, of whose "promises" he wrote to Charles enthusiastically, while at the same time he urged on the King how much his restoration would be facilitated by his conversion to Catholicism—"the only way to Heaven for persons of your Majestie's understanding." Ormonde was not impressed by Peter's diplomacy. On January 11th, after having had an interview with the Spanish commander at Brussels and discovering him to be by no means as eager as was represented, he wrote to Nicholas in Cologne: "You will finde that ether the Father is a most exquisite forger or the Counte [Fuensaldanha] a great desembler; but I am led to beleeve the former, out of the unhappy experience I have had of the Irish cleargy, and for other reasons." Ormonde was not so severe on all the brothers as Hyde, who wrote to him on January 7th that "they are all in the pack of knavery," and on the 14th that "hardly anything can be more evident than that they are all naught;" but he probably would have agreed with Hyde's remark in

the second letter that "the Jesuit should be sent to a remote convent and kept close from farther activity."

Gilbert's scheme was of a very different kind, and our belief in his own account of it must depend on what view we take of his character. Hyde speaks well of him neither in his letters nor in the *Continuation*, where he says that he, "being a half-witted fellow, did not meddle with any thing or angered [*sic*] any body, but found a way to get good clothes and to play, and was looked upon as a man of courage, having fought a duel or two with stout men." Hyde is here talking of Gilbert Talbot a few years later. It is peculiar that he should write of him not meddling with anything, seeing that he must have known, if only through Ormonde, that in 1655-6 he was most distinctly "meddling."

Gilbert, who held the rank of colonel since the days of the Confederation in Ireland, was at the time, like the majority of his fellow exiles, very ill provided with money to live upon and he conceived the idea, which Manning had pretended was his also, of getting some from the English Government. Among the Clarendon Papers is a letter, mostly in cipher, from Thurloe under the name of Johnson to "Mons. Burford" at Antwerp, in which he says that he will send some money soon, but that it is very dangerous. He desires "Burford," if possible, to get hold of Sexby's papers and send them to England

—Sexby being then in Brussels. A second letter a fortnight later says that Burford's mother and sisters are still at Carton, and that the writer hopes that they will not be transplanted.* What was expected from Burford (*i.e.*, valuable information) wholly fails, which discourages them (the English government), so that the writer cannot send money or any other commodities if the trade be no better. "Upon such slight terms men will part with nothing, but if they find gain coming will spare for nothing."

Burford is Gilbert Talbot, and from the fact that the letters appear among the Clarendon Papers it may be presumed that they were intercepted. Gilbert was obliged, therefore, to exculpate himself. On December 20th he went to see Ormonde, and on the following day he wrote to him asseverating that in getting into correspondence with Thurloe and Cromwell his intention was perfectly loyal. "I wish that I may at this instant sincke into Hell fire," he says, "if it was not purely my intention to serve His Majesty when this was first mentioned, and to deceive Cromwell." It was too late for him now to think of any base thought, after serving His Majesty for twelve years, "with the loss of my blood often and my friends." He did not desire to ask the King for money, but to obtain it from the enemy for His Majesty's service.

* As a matter of fact they were transplanted to Connaught next year, their names appearing in the lists preserved among the Ormonde manuscripts.

Gilbert apparently thought that he had satisfied Ormonde, or he would not have given George Lane reason to write as he did in the letter quoted above. But Ormonde took the precaution to have an order sent from Cologne to the postmaster at Antwerp to hold letters addressed to "Burford." On this Gilbert sent a letter of remonstrance. "I was much ashamed when [the postmaster] staggerd and lookt at me soe earnest," he said. God was his judge if he was not as real to the King as any in the world. He suggested that Ormonde should devise a good letter to the person (obviously Thurloe), so that he might send some money, which he would be glad to have. But he was willing to desist from the business, of which he was weary, seeing that he was suspected on account of it.

On Ormonde's arrival at Antwerp, matters must have been smoothed over a little, for when he left again on January 17th for Cologne he was escorted as far as Breda by Gilbert and Richard Talbot and a Father Patrick McGinn, a friend of Peter—strange company for his Lordship. The brothers Talbot returned to Antwerp, where fresh troubles were soon to come upon them.

As soon as he could get away from England Dongan had crossed the Channel. On January 30th he reached Dunkirk, where Stephens had been lying ill and destitute since his departure from London in September. Stephens had received a visit from the

treacherous Masten, whom apparently no one yet suspected except his master—now a close prisoner in the Tower, where he was destined to remain till Cromwell's death and the return to power of the Long Parliament. Dongan and Stephens at their meeting must have discussed the reasons of their failure and agreed that Dick Talbot's early escape from prison was suspicious. Moreover, while he was still in England after evading custody, Dongan had heard certain rumours. He sat down and wrote to Ormonde a note announcing his safe arrival, in the course of which he said: "I make noe questione you have herd of them reports that were of Dicke Talbot, but I could not gett any ground for them. But every body must answer for himself as I hope all them that knows annything of that buisness will answer for mee, for I can answer for nobody but my selfe."

Not content with this, Dongan wrote again: "I am very much out of countenance to lett your Lordshipe understand a thing which my duty commands mee to, which is more to me than all the frends in the world. The thing I mean is that there was strange reports of my oncol concerneing his betraying of Halsy and myselfe for this bisines. I could find noe ground at al but reports, which I thought it my duty to let your Lordshipe understand, and as for my part I will neither accuse him nor justefy him because I cannot doe it by profes either ways, which

if I could I would not trubel your Lordshipe with giving you this relation, but would take a cours with him myself. My Lady Issabela [Thynne] bids mee tell you that shee thought him innicent now since Manning was put to death; but tim[e] will bring out all." . . . .

Having delivered himself of these ungenerous insinuations against his kinsman Dongan set out on his way to Cologne, followed by a letter to Ormonde from Stephens, who ventured on the opinion that Dongan's "relation would in no way vindicate his uncle." Yet Stephens on the day he wrote had learnt, from a message smuggled out of the Tower of London by a fellow prisoner of Halsall, the certainty that Masten was a rogue and had betrayed his master and the others engaged in the assassination scheme.

Dongan's readiness to spread the rumour which he had heard among English Royalists before he left, that Dick Talbot was the traitor, is partly explained by the fact that he himself was under suspicion of having wrecked the plot by indiscretion. He may or may not have known that as early as December 9th Stephens had written to Ormonde, after having received a visit from Masten, to the effect that the three conspirators had been taken, "betrayed by the too lavish discourse of Dongan." He must at least have learnt of the report from Stephens at Dunkirk; and on his arrival in Brussels he found it was wide-

spread. "I here," he wrote indignantly to Ormonde, "Mr. O'Neil reports and tels everybody that I tould everybody my bisnes into England before I went, which is the greatest untruth that ever was."

That Dongan should be angry at the accusation of talking too freely, and thereby causing the failure of the conspiracy, was natural; but that he, and also Stephens at first, should be willing to impute to Dick Talbot such baseness as to betray his friends for Cromwell's gold is astonishing. The Royalists in England only knew that Talbot had made a most extraordinary escape from the Protector's clutches, so that it is less curious that they, who were not personally acquainted with him, should suggest an explanation of his good luck that reflected on his honour. In the case of Dongan it seems to have been mere selfish concern about himself which induced him to help in blackening his uncle's name.

Dongan arrived in Antwerp at the beginning of February and at once communicated to Peter Talbot there what was being said about his brother. On the same day Peter wrote to Ormonde—everyone appears to have written to Ormonde, who of those that, in Manning's words, ruled the roast had doubtless the most sympathetic nature—as follows:

"Robin Dongan . . . tells me of a strange report of Dick amongst some people in London. Hee thinks

it hath noe ground and sayes it is now [?] to Halsey's man or some other. Tyme will discover the truth. In the interim I will neyther flatter my inclination with judging him innocent nor bee rash in condemning him; but truly I will bee wary of all persons which lye under a cloud and such a base aspersion as this is. Whosoever betrays his King will betraye his brother. I am apt to believe that Gilbert's businesse hath given some occasion to this blemish of his brother, who came this night to mee from Brussels and is mad, swears and damns himselfe, wondring how people can as much as admit any such thoughts against him. Truly I thinke Gilb. would have more credit with his correspondent than hee hath if Dick were a knave."

Dick Talbot's "swearing and damning himself" here is an early example of his indulgence in a habit for which he became sadly notorious as he grew older. But he might well be annoyed now. Peter's attitude toward him, as expressed in this letter, is hardly brotherly. However, in another communication to Ormonde, Peter appears convinced that the reports were untrue, for he says: "Dick hath received the Blessed Sacrament in confirmation of his innocency. Truly, all circumstances and obligations both of honour and conscience considered, it is not only improbable but morally impossible that he should not only betray his King, but, in His Majesty, all his

own kindred, friends, and country, for a little sum which he must never enjoy or show, unless he be resolved to be deemed of all the most perfidious and infamous rogue."

Had he written in this strain at first, Father Talbot would have shown himself a better friend to his young brother. But, like Dongan, he seems to have been more concerned that his own name should stand well than to clear Dick's. As for the accused, he took up a manly and straightforward attitude at once. He knew of the charge against him before his nephew arrived in Antwerp; for as early as February 1st he sent off to Ormonde a vindication of himself, the most important part of which runs as follows:—

"I always thought that the testimonyes all those of our family gave of thyr fidelity to the Kings servis and in particular to Yr Excey and the many hazard that myself hath lately run in order thearunto ought merrit a better opinion of mee then I find thear is held of mee by some of the King's ministers thear, to bee Cromwells onely intelligence hear; if the loss of as much blood as I have lost in his servis, the quitteing of my fortune hear the last summer to go into England to venter the lives of my friends and my owne, my imprissonment thear for six months (which is a thing publikely knowne to the Kings best friends thear, tha it stood me in 400 St[erling]) and lastely my leyf lost (if I had not made my escape) bee not motive

sufficient to justify mee. My Lord, I am a gentleman, and if I wear soe wicked as to be soe voyd of all fidellity to my lawfull Prince as to turne rogue for intrest, yet I am not of soe despicable a sperrit as to doe an act so much below a Gentleman . . . . If I had stayed in England thear mought bee som more ground for that scandallous reporte . . . . I cannot imadgin how this should com to pass, but I hope my innocensy will apear, when som of those that accuse mee wilbe blak enow. I beleeve Robin Dongans coming hether now will confirme them in it and that his escape was permitted as being of relation to me, for it was that that raysed the first reporte in England of it. I should never have knowne that I was suspected but that the Chancelor thear writ to a certaine gentleman at Dunkerk [Stephens] to send into England to know the certainty from Halsy, but I am of opinion that Halsy is to honest a man to tax mee, if it bee not that he hath heard that I said that the attempt (at least) had beene made upon the Protectors person, but that hee, eyther through cowardis or some other private end, had obstructed it, and that I sayd to those that I was sure would tell him of it, and that I will justify . . . . Though I bee held now to have a correspondency with Cromwell I hope before many dayes pass that my actions will declare the contrary. All the favor that I beg of your Lop is that you will not prejudicate mee, and soe that his Matie and Yr Excy bee satisfied (as you may be very justly) those

others that harbour that opinion of mee may make further enquiry of it and if they find any evident proofes for it all the favor I desire from them is that they will prosecute mee . . ."

Ormonde's reply is not in existence, but that it was not unsatisfactory may be gathered in a second communication from Talbot, dated Antwerp, February 12th:—

"My Lord,

"I expected with much impatience Y^r Ex^cyes letter, which came to my hands soe very late yesterday that I had not time by the last poast to returne you my humble thanks for the ho[nou]r you did mee, and to say further, if it wear possible to bind mee more faythfully to his Ma^ties servis or more firme to y^r interests, soe oblidgeing a letter would infallibly doe it, but that being as impossible as my being the person I was represented thear to bee I doe promis myselfe that his Ma^tie and y^r selfe will (at least) suspend y^r ill opinions of mee untill you have some more convincing evidence of my guilt, and that once made aparent I shall very patiently submit myselfe to the punishment (in the publick view of the world) that the infamy and wickedness of my creyme doth requyer; and on the other syed, Y^r Ex^cy, I am confident, will allow that my petition is not unreasonable, if I beg that noe inconsidereble persons or little envoyes in England words be taken for it if they

give not som other proofes then thyr owne base surmises. . . .

"Though little, my Lord, I have seene of the world, I have observed that wharever thear was any undertakeing by any person never soe desserving and never soe really ment without other end then the publick good, and that it prooved unsuccessful, wear it never soe cleare that nothing was lost for want of care or contrivance, yet it must necessary follow that hee is blameable, becaus it succeeded not according to expectation. God forbid I should pleade the former and present endeavors of all those of our own familyes (in serveing his Ma^tie^) for my owne justification. I will only say one word, that in my opinion is convinceing enow, that if intrest were soe prevalent with mee as to make mee quit all honestye it is not by giveing intelligence from hence that I could make my greatest benefit. I could before I came out of England by slipeing but a very few words gaine myself a fortune, and my friends likewise during our lives, and nobody know neyther who hurt him. But I prays God for it, I am not of soe covetous a disposition as to prefer mony before my contience, my loyalty and my hon^r^. I have lived hitherto without beeing a trouble or discredit to my friends, and I hope will continue it. I shall not trouble Y^r^ Ex. furthur in this matter. I know not what I may suffer at present in y^r^ opinion, but I hope tyme will give mee opertunity to make the contrary evidently apear. The

dayly hazard of my life shall justify mee whear (I fear) my accusers dare not show thyr faces, and since you have always been the Patron of us all I humbly crave yr assistance in my vindication in this particular that soe neerely concerns the reputation of,

"My Lord,

"Yr Excyes most faythfull and obedient servant,

"R. Talbot."

The arrival of further information from England, including letters from poor Halsall, half starved and threatened with all manner of tortures in the Tower, made it plain at last that, besides Manning, the chief agent in the failure of the plot was William Masten, and the reputation of the Talbot brothers was cleared. Even Gilbert's explanation must have been accepted, that his dealings with Thurloe and Cromwell had been a mere trick to get money out of the enemy by false pretences; for he was visited with no punishment. His scheme was in any case spoilt by Richard's escape, as the latter had feared it would be, and he was unable to secure any "commodities" from Thurloe. Hyde continued to rail at the brothers, particularly at his *bête noire*, "the foolish Father," who ought to be sent to some distant convent and restrained by his superiors, unless he had "purposely been let loose to do mischief."* But the

* These expressions occur in letters from Hyde to Sir Henry de Vic, Charles's resident at Brussels, on January 14th and 18th, 1656, but Hyde is always writing in this strain.

Talbots managed to dispense with Hyde's friendship, and the youngest of them was destined soon to establish himself well beyond the power of even the Chancellor to harm him.

Richard Talbot does not come ill out of the affair, except in so far as he consented to take part in a scheme to "do Cromwell's business," as Sexby euphemistically writes of one of these plots. And in that matter, it has been said already, his conduct must not be judged by modern standards. If as high-placed and high-minded Royalists as Hyde, Ormonde, and Nicholas, to mention no others, did not shrink from the idea, a young adventurer like Talbot could not be expected to look upon the removal of the usurper and regicide as a base act. Had he, however, consented to sell his fellow-conspirators or to turn spy after his capture to save his life and provide himself with an income, he would justly be condemned by both contemporary and modern standards of ethics. But it is impossible to find the slightest evidence for such a charge, and it can only make us think less well not only of such as Robert Dongan and Peter, but also of the Chancellor Hyde, that they should have entertained the ignoble thought about him. Hyde was blinded by the prejudice of a narrow if honest man. Dongan and, in a less degree, Peter Talbot were actuated by selfish fear for their own reputations.

CHAPTER IV

LIFE IN FLANDERS

IN the spring of 1656 Charles's ministers, after long and what must have been exceedingly exasperating negotiations, complicated by the officious assistance of Peter Talbot, succeeded in bringing about the treaty with Spain which was to act as a counterpoise to Cromwell's treaty with France. The latter agreement had been made definite in November, 1655. On the following April 12th Ormonde and Rochester signed a secret instrument with the Spanish representatives, Fuensaldanha and Cardenas, at Brussels. Spain, hard pressed by want of money and having already on hand as many quarrels as she could well tackle, had been very loth to proceed to war with England, great as were the outrages to which she had to submit from Cromwell. But she yielded at last to the inevitable, and now, as far as promises were concerned, made great concessions to Charles. His Majesty had already entered Spanish territory early

in March, in anticipation of the treaty, and on its signature he took up his residence officially at Bruges.

An important clause in the Anglo-Spanish agreement provided for the employment by Spain of English and Irish levies in the war against France. Certain Irish regiments had remained in the Spanish service since their first exile, among their officers being Walter Dongan (now by the death of his father a baronet) and his brother William. But their numbers had constantly dwindled through discontent over lack of pay and rations. On the other hand, France, a better paymaster, had a large body of English, Scottish and Irish troops still in her army; and the Duke of York, though after the Cromwell-Mazarin treaty he was compelled to give up his French command, continued in the country, in defiance of the provision for his banishment. A necessary consequence of the Brussels treaty was the transference of all royalist volunteers from the French to the Spanish flag. A great advantage of this was that it would collect in Flanders a force ready to move when the long-projected invasion of England should at last take place. In the gathering together of this force the brothers Gilbert and Richard Talbot were assigned a leading part, which seems sufficient proof that they were both considered to have rebutted successfully the accusations against their loyalty.

It is chiefly in the correspondence of that indefatigable letter-writer, Father Peter, that we find allusions

to his family's doings at this period. Undeterred by anyone's disapproval, secret or openly expressed, he continued to write constantly to the King, to Ormonde, and even to Hyde. In a letter to Charles on May 10th he speaks of Gilbert's "rendezvous" at Ghent on the 20th of the month. Gilbert, and with him at intervals Richard, were in charge of the recruiting department in this town. But Richard also was seeing some active service in the Spanish ranks. The arrival of Don Juan, natural son of the King of Spain, as governor of the Spanish Netherlands, was followed by considerable military activity, and for a time by unwonted success. A Spanish garrison had been shut up in Valenciennes. When Don Juan defeated the French and raised the siege "Dick, with some English gentlemen placed by him among Condé's troops," was present, as we learn from Peter's letter to Ormonde on June 29th. Charles sent a note of congratulation to Don Juan, using as his messenger "*le chevalier* Talbot," probably Gilbert. On July 24th Peter wrote again to Ormonde from Brussels, giving various details about members of their two families. Dick, he says, has found two German counts at Brussels, who promise to bring a hundred German soldiers with them as volunteers whenever the King shall make an attempt on England. Ormonde's nephew Muskerry* is still with his regiment

* *i. e.* Cormac MacCarty, of whom we shall hear again soon. He was commonly known as Colonel Muskerry, from his father's title of Viscount Muskerry.

on the French side, under Turenne. Robert Dongan had been hoping to make his fortune by winning money at play from "a raw young gentleman," but those who had care of the youth refused to pay up.

Other letters from Peter introduce frequently the name of "Thom"—Thomas Talbot, the Franciscan friar, with whom we have met already as the bearer of a message from Charles II. to Owen O'Neil in Ireland. Of this member of the stock which he so much disliked, Hyde draws a most unfavourable picture. Thomas, like Peter, had entered the Church, but, "being a merry fellow, was the more made of for laughing at and contemning his brother the Jesuit, who had not so good natural parts, though by his education he had more sobriety and lived without scandal in his manners." Thomas, on the other hand, was notorious for his debauchery, and, in consequence of the severe discipline put upon him by the superiors of his order, hated his habit, which he called his "fool's coat." In London after the Restoration, according to Hyde, he preferred to wear what he styled "man's clothes," *i.e.*, lay dress.

Hyde's portrait is, no doubt, somewhat highly coloured. But in Peter's correspondence there is quite sufficient to show that the friar was a source of great anxiety to his relatives. Queen Henrietta Maria employed him as an envoy to the new Pope, Alexander VII., in 1655. But in the April of the following year we find Father James Talbot, a

cousin, writing to Peter in scathing terms of Tom, who was in Paris on some business of raising funds for the royalist exiles. Tom is "a disgrace to his function, name and nation, in a poor and miserable condition, living without mass, matins or any other mark of a Christian, perfidious to all who most oblige him, and no Jew more mercenary than he." Father James wonders the King should impart his secret to one who would for gain sell both secret and master and who would be better in his convent than living as he does now. Peter forwarded this letter to the King, protesting that Tom is not altogether so bad as he is described by his cousin, whom he suspects of being "at cuffs" with him. But on July 12th Peter himself writes to Ormonde that he sends his letter by Dick or by Robin Dongan, for Tom (then in Brussels) cannot be trusted with a letter, as he is too curious; and on July 31st that "Thom tells so many lies that we can never believe him, though sometimes he may speak truth . . . He swears he has never said an ill word of the Chancellor or of Ormonde in this town [Brussels] . . . but his tongue cannot prejudice any man." Peter wrote also about the troublesome Tom to Hyde, who drily replied that he hoped he would persuade his brother to "resume his habit and sit still." The friar, it appears, was cherishing a scheme, of which Hyde did not at all approve, for levying three thousand men in Ireland, ostensibly for the French

service, and preparing the nation to rise when the King thought fit. In this he hoped to interest the head of his house, Sir Robert.

As a matter of fact, Father Tom was scarcely more of a terror to the royalist leaders than Father Peter,* about whose visit to Bruges Ormonde writes to Hyde at the beginning of September. He does not know what the Father's business in the town is unless it be to make provision for his brothers upon their raising of the regiments; but he complains that the Jesuit's religious zeal had transported him into a great passion with O'Neil for endeavouring to make a servant-boy of his a Protestant; and he fears that Peter may do them ill offices with regard to the practice of their devotions—a question of some considerable difficulty under the bigoted rule of Spain.

The recruiting of the royalist regiments for the Spanish army, which had begun under the supervision of the Talbots, proceeded apace, in spite of the grudging support of the Spanish military authorities in the Netherlands, perpetually harassed by want of money. By November, 1656, the number of men gathered together was estimated at six thousand, and

* The most amusing attack on Peter Talbot is to be found in a letter to Hyde from George Digby, Earl of Bristol, a few months later. Bristol (who before the end of 1658 was to become a Roman Catholic) hopes they may be rid of "the ghostly Father" by getting him sent to a more religious life, unless he go into England, in which case he may possibly be a martyr, which is all the hurt he personally wishes him. "God forgive your uncharitableness of wishing him in a well!" (*Calendar of Clarendon State Papers*, III., art. 690. Letter of January 18th, 1657.)

nearly all the Irish nobles formerly in the French service had arrived in Flanders. The transfer of troops from the French to the Spanish side was not accomplished without difficulty, owing to the scruples of some of their officers over this change of coat—and also, no doubt, to the good treatment which they had received in France. Cormac MacCarty had at last been induced to come to Flanders, and he was gradually followed by the rest. It was easier, however, to bring the men together than to keep them together when brought, so meagre and unwilling was the provision made for them by the Spaniards; and the numbers were therefore always fluctuating through fresh arrivals and desertions. However, four regiments were formed, which were respectively assigned to the Duke of Gloucester, Ormonde, Sir Thomas Middleton, and Rochester; to which were afterwards added a fifth, under the Duke of York, when he had reluctantly yielded to the pressure put upon him to make him leave France, and a sixth, under the Earl of Bristol at first. A very unflattering picture is drawn of the royalist army by an English enemy in Flanders; but it must be remembered that it was not to the interest of a man in his profession to represent them in an unduly favourable light. "Of all the armies in Europe," writes one of Thurloe's spies to him in April, 1657, "there is none wherein so much debauchery is to be seen as in this few forces which the said King hath gotten together,

being so exceedingly profane from the highest to the lowest. The Irish are trump among them and bear away the bell for number and preferment."

With the general history of the remaining period of royalist exile in Flanders, so full of abortive plots, unsuccessful negotiations, distressing quarrels, and miserable hardships, we are not here concerned, for Richard Talbot played but a small part after his flash into prominence in connection with the scheme against Cromwell in 1655. A piece of good fortune, however, came to him which had the utmost influence upon his subsequent life. He attracted the favourable notice of the Duke of York and was taken by him into his household.

James—sorely against his will, for he was sincerely attached to Turenne, the great soldier under whom he had learnt the art of war—reached Flanders from Paris at the end of September, 1656. His position in Spanish territory was very uncomfortable from the first. Treated with distrust and jealousy by the Spaniards, he had really to fight his way to their esteem, and even his reckless bravery was a cause of offence to them.* Moreover, attached as Charles and

* Concerning the personal courage of James II., which was to be so much called in question later, the most interesting expression of opinion is to be found in Pepys's *Diary* for June 4th, 1664. Speaking to Pepys of the Duke, William Coventry says: "He is more himself, and more of judgement is at hand in him, in the middle of a desperate service than at other times, as appeared in the business of Dunkirke [in 1658], wherein no man ever did braver things or was in hotter service in the close of that day, being surrounded with enemies; and then, contrary to the advice of all about him, his counsel carried himself

James were to one another throughout life, their peculiar circumstances in exile furnished occasion for many misunderstandings between them. James was both better loved by his mother and more popular with a large section of the Royalists than was Charles. In 1659 we find Tom Talbot, and even Peter,* accused of attempting to magnify the Duke in England at the expense of the King. Perhaps it was fear of a "Duke's party" which prompted the attempt, immediately after James's arrival in Flanders, to remove from his household those whom he most trusted. Now even James's detractors—and has any King of England had more numerous and more bitter?—allow that he was loyal to those for whom he had once conceived an affection. Charles, or his advisers, tried to part the Duke from the Berkeleys, uncle and nephew, and from Harry Jermyn, nephew to the powerful lord who ruled the household of

and the rest through them safe, by advising that he might make his passage with but a dozen with him; 'For,' says he, 'the enemy cannot move after me so fast with a great body, and with a small one we shall be enough to deal with them'; and though he is a man naturally martiall to the highest degree, yet a man that never in his life talks one word of himself or service of his own, but only that he saw such or such a thing, and lays it down for a maxime that a Hector can have no courage."

* Hyde writes to Ormonde that Peter actually proposed to Colonel Bampfield that James should be put in Charles's place (letter of October 11th, 1659, among the Carte Papers). The Jesuit was aware of such charges against him. Among the Carte Papers also is a letter from him to Ormonde, dated July 25th, 1659, in which he says: "The aspersions cast upon me of setting up an interest for the Duke of York in opposition to the King, and speaking disrespectfully of his Matie's person, are so contrary to the principles of honesty [and] good manners that I hope none who knows my conversation and education will believe them."

Queen Henrietta Maria. James was even ordered to leave the elder Berkeley behind him in France, but he disobeyed the order. An attempt was made to undermine Berkeley's influence with the help of Henry Bennet, the Duke's secretary, who pleased the King (according to Hyde) by his "pleasant and agreeable humour." The result was only to make James dislike Bennet. To another command to banish Berkeley, on the ground that he was an enemy of Spain—and he was indeed a warm friend to France—James replied with a positive refusal to give up any of his servants and fled from Bruges into Dutch territory. After about a month's absence he was induced to come back, but only when Charles (who was in the utmost alarm lest his brother should return to France and so compromise him with Spain) had yielded to his demand for the retention of the Berkeleys and Jermyn. As for Bennet, he was sent to Madrid as the King's representative, to console him for the loss of his post as secretary to the Duke.

Affairs went none too smoothly even after this concession of the King, and there is no doubt that much of Charles's wretchedness during the last years of his exile, which made him at times declare himself weary of life, was due to his dissensions with his family, who almost always sided with one another against him when there was a difference of opinion.

At what date the Duke of York added Richard Talbot to his household does not appear. Hyde in

mentioning the fact simply says: "He was a very handsome young man, wore good clothes, and was without a doubt of a clear, ready courage, which was virtue enough to recommend a man to the Duke's good opinion, which, with more expedition than could be expected, he got to that degree that he was made of the bedchamber."

That Hyde does not exaggerate the rapid rise of Talbot in James's favour is proved by Carte's account of his appointment to the lieutenant-colonelcy of the Duke of York's Regiment. The nucleus of this force had been the men which Cormac MacCarty had taken over with him from Ireland to Spain. Cormac MacCarty, the eldest son of Viscount Muskerry (created by the King Earl of Clancarty in 1658) and Eleanor Butler, sister of the Marquis of Ormonde, was, according to Hyde, "a young man of extraordinary courage and expectation . . . and had the general estimation of an excellent officer." His regiment was composed of Munster men, mostly his own tenants and dependents, and had followed him when he changed from the Spanish to the French side, fighting with distinction on the latter. When Charles after the Brussels treaty recalled his subjects from the French army, MacCarty's men, in spite of the obstacles put in their way in France, came after him into Flanders. Here they were renamed the Duke of York's Regiment, MacCarty continuing to command them as colonel. Again they distinguished

From a photo by Emery Walker, after a painting by Sir Peter Lely at St. James's Palace, by courtesy of Mr. Henry Frowde.

JAMES, DUKE OF YORK
(afterwards James the Second).

themselves in active service against their old allies. When a vacancy occurred for a lieutenant-colonel MacCarty wished to promote one of his officers. But the ambitious Richard Talbot seized the opportunity and "pushed to be put in that command," says Carte. MacCarty having rejected his application, the dispute ran so high that a duel took place, of which we do not hear the result. Talbot must now have appealed to the Duke and received his support, for Hyde and Ormonde in indignation went to the King and pointed out the impropriety of putting him into one of the highest commands in a Munster regiment, over the heads of its officers and in defiance of the wishes of its colonel, who, like his father, had deserved so well of the King. The post, they said, was not one which a man would desire unless his passions had got the better of his judgment. They lectured Charles, indeed, in a manner which reminds one of Hyde's many harangues as reported by him in the *Continuation*. But His Majesty remained deaf to their arguments, saying that his brother had set his heart on Talbot's appointment and that he would not interfere.

Charles, no doubt, was anxious to avoid further interference with favourites of his brother after James had shown so plainly by his flight to Holland the obstinacy of his attachments.

In estimating the extent of Talbot's triumph we may note that Pepys, in his entry for December 15th,

1664, speaks of the very great influence exercised over the Duke of York by Lords Muskerry and Fitzharding—the former Cormac MacCarty and Charles Berkeley. And we know that James's friendship with MacCarty was already firm in 1656.* Talbot had therefore succeeded in persuading the Duke to give him the post which he coveted in spite of a strong sentiment prompting James to refuse the favour. The young man was naturally delighted. In view of the intervention of Hyde and Ormonde, he could not forbear exulting in his victory over such powerful antagonists. Peter, Thomas and Gilbert Talbot all congratulated him warmly and "made it their business to trumpet about their brother Dick's great interest with His Royal Highness." In this affair we may perhaps trace the origin of Dick's intermittent enmity towards Ormonde, which was to be manifested on numerous occasions after the Restoration. Ormonde's effort on behalf of his nephew was only reasonable, but this consideration was hardly likely to count with one who, as Carte says, was "subject to the common frailty of youth, vanity, and infinitely ambitious."

Talbot and MacCarty, we have seen, attempted to settle their difference with the sword. Duels were of unhappy frequency among the royalist exiles at this period. Among the Sutherland MSS. is preserved a letter to Sir Andrew Newport in England from

* See the story in Clarke's *Life of James II.*, I., 282-4.

somebody in Amiens, dated September 4th [1658], which says: "'Tis strange to hear of the dissensions among the exiled English, Scotch and Irish in Flanders . . . I saw a relation of a quarrel, under my [Lord Taa]ffe's hand, between him and a Scotchman of my acquaintance, one Sir William Keith; the dispute was only for three royals and a half at tennis. Sir William Keith was slain upon the place; upon this great occasion also were engaged four persons besides the principals. Upon Taaffe's side Dick Talbot fought and wounded Dick Hopton in two places; and on Taaffe's side, again, one Davis fought with Sir William Fleming, but no harm done."

The Hopton whom Talbot wounded in so trivial a cause was the man who attempted in the year after Talbot to carry out a scheme against Cromwell similar to that in which he had been engaged. Like his adversary, Hopton had been captured and confined at Whitehall, and, like him, again, he had succeeded in escaping at a considerable expense of money. It may be gathered that it was not so much a matter of a debt for a game of tennis as national jealousy which occasioned the quarrel. The exiles in Flanders were disheartened by their long waiting, suspicious of one another, penniless and often hungry, and prone to squabbles. The King was always an enemy of the duel, but at the present juncture in his affairs he was powerless to prevent his adherents from letting

loose their ill-temper in this fashion. Both the lay members of the Talbot family then in Flanders took their share in the outbreak of violence, though we do not hear that either killed his man. It is reasonable to suppose that it was at this time that our hero gained his name of "Fighting Dick Talbot."

But the end of the evil days of exile was gradually approaching. The death of the Protector, it is true, was not immediately followed by the recall of the King, as had been hoped, and a further period of plots and disappointments intervened. New opportunities hereby offered themselves to Peter and Thomas Talbot for gratifying their mania for intrigue. The friar came under grave suspicion of dealing with the enemy; but it is quite probable that he had really no disloyal intentions, and imagined himself to be furthering the King's cause. On May 6/16th, 1659, he writes to Ormonde from Paris, justifying a secret journey of his into England and a meeting with Thurloe the previous year. "Though I went into England," he says, "upon the score I mention, you may say I condemn myself for not acquainting the King. I assure you, my Lord, I durst not appear in Court, [as], being commanded from it, it was not seasonable; my intention being, if the treaty were real, both to acquaint the King and improve my endeavours for his service." Both Talbot's scheme and the style of his letter are

tortuous, and it is not easy to understand what he intended. His protestations of innocence were apparently believed, for no harm came to him.

Peter was not so fortunate. It would take too long to follow his persistent intrigues with the Spaniards, first in Flanders and then in Madrid, in the course of which he began by opposing and belittling Bennet, the King's representative, as "a creature of Bristol's and our enemy," and ended by making a friend of him and persuading him to accept him as a kind of unofficial colleague in the Spanish capital, to Hyde's loudly expressed disgust. He too, like Tom, had paid a visit to England in 1658; in fact, according to one account, he was in London for Cromwell's funeral. When he arrived in Madrid his enemies accused him of being an agent of the Commonwealth. Hyde directly affirms that he was sent to Spain, when the negotiations for the Treaty of the Pyrenees were in progress at Fuentarabia, to procure England's inclusion in the peace and Charles's exclusion and banishment from Flanders. Charles complained to Bennet of this, but the Jesuit prevailed so much with the Ambassador that he actually undertook to reconcile him to the King. In this Bennet did not at first succeed, if the statement of Peter's bitter opponent, Peter Walsh, be true that, in return for his attempt to "betray and utterly ruin" his cause in 1659, Charles brought about his formal expulsion from the Jesuit order. Although the

Franciscan is a doubtful authority where Peter Talbot is concerned, his statement is supported by a letter of Hyde's at the end of July, in which he speaks of "Talbot, late a Jesuit." But Peter is found on perfectly good terms with the Jesuits afterwards; and as for his relations with the King, in May, 1660, he acts as conveyer of a Spanish contribution to Breda, and Hyde himself represents him as a conspicuous figure at Whitehall after the Restoration, daringly displaying himself in his clerical robes about the Palace.*

In the household of the Duke of York Richard was happily removed from the temptation of mixing himself up in the intrigues of his clerical brothers, and we hear little more of him before the Restoration. In August, 1659, hopes were strong that England would at once declare for the King's return, and in anticipation of a general rising, Charles hastened from Flanders to the French coast, with orders to James to come after him at once. The Duke left Brussels accompanied only by Lord Langdale, Charles Berkeley, and one attendant. Talbot followed with the elder Berkeley the same evening, and the rest of the Duke's household apparently soon after, for in September we find them all returning to Brussels. The expected rising proved a disappointment, and there was nothing to be done except go

* He proposed from the first to live there openly, "as many more do of my condition, who are openly winked at," but yielded to pressure until he was able to appear as almoner to Queen Catherine.

back to Flanders. A letter of September 14th says: "All the Duke of York's people, viz. the Barkleys, Talbot, Bronkart [*i.e.* William Brounker], Leyton, with my Lord Langdale, &c., are returned to Bruxells, and the Duke himself expected to-morrow." Another season of gloom followed, deepened by the withdrawal of funds for the royalist troops by Spain when she came to terms with France. Poverty was acuter than at any period during the long exile, and the Duke was glad enough to accept a post as Admiral of the Spanish navy, though knowing that it was bound to be honorary unless he became a Roman Catholic—which at this time was very far from his thoughts, in spite of Carte's belief to the contrary.*

With the arrival of 1660 the end at last came to the distressing situation. When restoration was certain, first the Royal Dukes and then the King himself, with their households, escaped from the hospitality of Spain, which had inspired in them so few pleasant memories, and sought that of Holland, hitherto denied to them, but now gladly proffered and even pressed on them. At the Hague their reception was on a most lavish scale, £6,000 being presented to the King; and the flocking thither of deputations from across the Channel added to the enthusiastic rejoicings over the changed state of

* Carte even asserts that Richard Talbot "knew the secret of the Duke of York's religion" (*Ormond*, IV., 70). It is now certain, however, that there was as yet no such secret to be known. James had a secret at this period; but that was his contract with Anne Hyde, to which we come in the next chapter.

affairs. Then arrived the English fleet, under Pepys's cousin, Edward Montagu, to carry the royal party home. When all was ready for the journey to England, the Duke of York, accompanied no doubt by Richard Talbot, boarded the *Naseby*, now renamed the *Royal Charles*, and took command of the squadron as Admiral once more of the English navy, after a lapse of a dozen years. On May 24th the exiles left the Hague, and on the morning of the 25th they landed at Dover, amid a most remarkable demonstration of thankfulness and joy. Four years and a half previously Talbot had made his escape from the country, nailed up under the boards of a boat, a fugitive from the enemies of the King. Now he returned to witness the landing of the King who had apparently no enemy left.

CHAPTER V

TALBOT AND HIS TRADUCERS

IN the general joy of the nation over the restoration of Charles II. was mingled a pleasurable anticipation, on the part of all who had deserved or thought they had deserved well of the King, concerning the rewards which they were to receive. The Talbots and their kindred were among those who hoped for honours. For Sir Robert Talbot a viscountship was asked, if he did not himself make such a claim. Sir Walter Dongan did not scruple to press his uncle Peter to recommend him to Ormonde for a similar distinction.* Neither of them obtained the honour, though Sir Walter's brother William in February, 1661, was created Viscount Dongan of

* "Sir Robert is so bashfull," writes Peter Talbot to Ormonde on June 5th, 1660, "that if you speake not to him and persuade him to be a Viscount he will never move it." On the other hand, "Sir Walter Dongan . . . recommended me to put your Exce in mind of his Viscountship of Kildroght."

Clane. In truth, it would have been impossible for the King to gratify the wishes of all who looked to him for favour. Whitehall was besieged by a clamorous crowd, all urging their own eminent merits and depreciating one another. Well might Clarendon speak of the "unhappy temper and constitution of the royal party," which he believes to have had a most pernicious effect on the King's character, driving him to "leave all things to their natural course and God's providence," while abandoning himself to dissipation.

At the restored Court Richard Talbot, now at the age of thirty Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the Duke of York and lieutenant-colonel in his regiment, was well placed for advancement. He soon succeeded in attaining higher military rank, being made colonel of a troop of cavalry, in spite of his Roman Catholicism. Yet even he, so great a favourite with his master, could not but experience the severity of the struggle for position, in which straightforward methods could do little for an ambitious man. The temptation was strong to have recourse to crooked ways, and many of the greatest persons of the period stooped —and stooped very low indeed, in some cases— to conquer.

We are now brought to the examination of the question whether Talbot in his anxiety for preferment sank to the degradation which Lord Macaulay alleges

against him; and the evidence must be examined in detail, for if Macaulay's accusation be proved, then our verdict upon Talbot's character cannot be other than hostile. In fact, if the charge be true, we may without difficulty believe almost anything against him.

When Edward Hyde went into exile from England he took with him his daughter Anne. Mary Princess of Orange, whether attracted by her or out of a desire to gratify her brother Charles's trusted minister, offered to make her one of her maids of honour. Hyde was against Anne's acceptance of the post, but his wife, ambitious for her daughter, overruled him, and Anne went to Mary's Court. On a visit to Queen Henrietta Maria in Paris, Mary brought her maid with her; and here she was seen by James, Duke of York. James in his memoirs, relates the sequel thus:

"Besides her person, she [Anne Hyde] had all the qualities proper to inflame a heart less apt to take fire than his; while she managed so well as to bring his passion to such a height as, between the time he first saw her and the winter before the King's restoration, he resolved to marry none but her; and promised her to do it: and though at first, when the Duke asked the King his brother for his leave, he refused and diswaded him from it; yet at last he opposed it no more; and the Duke married her privately, owned it some time after, and was

ever a true friend to the Chancellor, for several years."*

The secret contract between James and Anne was made in the autumn in 1659, and after it they looked upon themselves as man and wife, with the result that, when the Restoration took place, they must have known that a child was on its way to them. But James the exile, dependent on the bounty of France or Spain, and James Duke of York at Whitehall, standing near the throne which might one day be his, were very different persons. The exile had shown considerable decision of character. The Royal Duke was a prey to a host of conflicting desires, and by his wavering attitude now brought discredit upon his name.

Two contemporary accounts of what followed are to be found, in the *Memoirs of Gramont* and in the *Continuation of the Life of Clarendon;* the one sparkling and malicious, the other sober and sententious. The version in the *Memoirs* may be dealt with first.

Gramont, or Anthony Hamilton, whichever of them we may consider responsible for this particular story, asserts that the Duke of York, at first, "was so far from repenting of his secret marriage with Anne Hyde that he seemed only to wish for the

* Carte's Extract from the Memoirs, in Macpherson, *Original Papers*, I., 17. Concerning James's admission of the aptitude of his heart to take fire, see his instructions to his son in Macpherson, I., 77, where he acknowledges with shame and regret that he was too much a slave to the passion.

King's restoration, that he might have an opportunity of declaring it with splendour." But when he saw himself enjoying a rank which placed him so near the throne and reflected on the indignation which the announcement would create at Court, and indeed throughout the whole kingdom, the matter looked otherwise to him. He knew that his brother would refuse his consent. On the other hand, his conscience bound him to adhere to his marriage contract, even if, after the early fervour of his affection for Anne Hyde had passed away, he had eyes for the many beauties of Whitehall.

In his perplexity James "opened his heart to Falmouth"—that is to say, to Charles Berkeley, for Gramont anticipates by more than four years his rise to the rank of Earl. The Duke "could not have applied to a better man in his own interests, nor to a worse in Miss Hyde's. For at first Falmouth maintained not only that he was not married, but that it was indeed impossible that he could ever have conceived such an idea; that any marriage was invalid for him which was made without the King's consent, even if the party were a suitable match; but that it was a mere jest even to think of the daughter of an insignificant lawyer,* whom the favour

* The "insignificant lawyer" was made Lord High Chancellor of England on Sir Edward Herbert's death at the beginning of 1658—having been for fifteen years previously Chancellor of the Exchequer to Charles I. and his son; but he was not raised to the peerage (as Baron Hyde of Hindon) until November, 1660.

of his sovereign had lately made a peer of the realm, without any noble blood, and chancellor without any capacity; that, as for his scruples, he had only to give ear to some gentlemen that he could introduce, who would inform him thoroughly concerning Miss Hyde's conduct before he became acquainted with her; and, provided that he did not tell them that he really was married, he would soon have sufficient grounds to come to a determination. The Duke of York consented, and Lord Falmouth, having assembled both his council and his witnesses, led them to His Royal Highness's cabinet, after having instructed them how to act. These gentlemen were the Earl of Arran,* Jermyn, Talbot and Killigrew, all men of honour, but who infinitely preferred the interest of the Duke of York to Miss Hyde's reputation, and who, besides, were greatly dissatisfied, like the whole of the Court, at the insolent authority of the Prime Minister."

The story goes on that the Duke informed the assembled gentlemen that they could not be unaware of his affection for Miss Hyde, but they might not know that he was under an engagement to perform certain promises to her. Therefore, as the innocence of persons of her age was generally exposed to Court scandal, and as some reports, false or true, had been spread abroad concerning her conduct, he asked them, both in friendship and in duty, to tell him sincerely

* *i. e.*, Richard Butler, Ormonde's second son.

all they knew upon the subject. "All appeared rather reserved at first," continues Gramont, "and seemed not to dare give their opinions on so serious and delicate a matter; but the Duke of York having renewed his entreaties, each began to relate the particulars of what he knew, and perhaps more than he knew, about poor Miss Hyde; nor did they omit any circumstance necessary to strengthen the evidence."

We need not follow the *Memoirs of Gramont* into all the unpleasant evidence which they allege to have been brought forward by the four witnesses against Anne Hyde's moral character. But, since Lord Macaulay finds in Gramont's accusation against Richard Talbot here the ground for his most virulent abuse of his victim, it is necessary perhaps to quote the actual words of the *Memoirs*. "Talbot said that she had made an appointment with him in the Chancellor's cabinet, while he was at a council meeting; and that, not paying so much attention to what was on the table as to what they were engaged in, they had spilt a bottle of ink upon a despatch of four pages, and that the King's monkey, which was blamed for the accident, was a long time in disgrace."

When he had heard what the four had to say, the Duke thanked them for their frankness, enjoined secrecy upon them, and went to the King's apartments. Berkeley, waiting in the presence-chamber

while the brothers conversed long in private, told Lord Ossory, eldest son of the Duke of Ormonde, what had just happened. At last the Duke of York came out and told them to meet him in about an hour's time at the Chancellor's. When they arrived, Berkeley and Ossory found Anne Hyde weeping, and her father in rage and despair. But the Duke said to them, with the serene and pleasant countenance generally accompanying the announcement of good news: "As you are the two men of the Court whom I most esteem, I desire that you should first have the honour of paying your respects to the Duchess of York. There she is!"

Gramont concludes the tale by saying that, while the four coxcombs who had slandered Anne Hyde were much afraid of the consequences of their conduct, she, though fully aware of their accusations, so far from showing resentment, treated them with studious kindness and told them that nothing was a greater proof of the attachment of a man of honour than the putting his friend's or master's interest above his own reputation. Gramont's comment is: "A remarkable example of prudence and moderation not only for the fair sex, but even for those who value themselves most upon their philosophy among the men."

Perhaps it is hardly necessary to remark that this narrative is not of such a kind that we should be willing to accept it implicitly, coming from s

generally untrustworthy a source as the lively composition of Gramont and his brother-in-law, unless we could find some contemporary corroboration. Now the quarter in which we should naturally look for corroboration is the autobiography of the maligned lady's father. If anyone had reason to inveigh against the conduct of Anne's traducers it was Edward Hyde. We cannot go far wrong in assuming that what Hyde does not say about the matter could not truthfully be said; for, honest man as he was, he was a bitter enemy, and with regard to the Talbots he himself admits that he was considered to be biassed against the whole family. Let us see therefore the Chancellor's account of the plot against Anne Hyde, confining ourselves to a brief paraphrase, for the most part, of the narrative of a very verbose writer.

According to the *Continuation* "the first matter of general and public importance" after the Restoration, apart from Parliamentary affairs, was the discovery of the secret marriage of the Duke of York and the Chancellor's daughter—"with which nobody was so surprised and confounded as the Chancellor himself, who being of a nature free from any jealousy, and very confident of an entire affection and obedience from all his children, and particularly from that daughter whom he had always loved dearly, never had in the least degree suspected any such thing; though he knew afterwards that the Duke's affection

and kindness had been much spoken of beyond the seas, but without the least suspicion in anybody that it could ever tend to marriage." (Absorption in public affairs, no doubt, accounts for his ignorance of what was going on in his own household; for it is related that Ashley Cooper, dining at the Hydes' one day with Southampton, told him that he was convinced Anne was married to one of the Royal brothers, her mother's only half-suppressed respect for her proving this.) Hyde goes on to state that the Duke's fondness was encouraged by his own declared enemies, who hoped to see disgrace falling on him and his family through it. Chief among these was Sir Charles Berkeley, who was abetted by most of the others of the Duke's household. James himself, in spite of his love for the daughter, was unfavourably disposed toward Hyde, sharing the prejudice of Queen Henrietta Maria. The Chancellor's foes, therefore, had no very difficult task in exerting an evil influence in the matter.

At first, however, the Duke of York acted honourably enough. When it was reported that Hyde was desirous of making a good match for his daughter, he went to the King, informed him of the secret contract and of Anne's expectation of a child, and begged permission for a public marriage. If consent were denied, he protested with many tears, he would immediately leave the kingdom and spend his life in foreign parts. Charles, very much troubled,

called to him Ormonde and Southampton, as bosom friends of the Chancellor, and told them to bring him into his presence. Ormonde explained what the business was, whereon Hyde "broke out into a very immoderate passion against the wickedness of his daughter" and swore he would turn her out of his house, using some very strong language and calling for her execution! In the midst of his agony the King came into the room and attempted to calm him, "looking upon him with a wonderful benignity." Indeed, Charles, on the Chancellor's testimony, behaved most admirably. He put aside Hyde's reiterated demand for his daughter's instant punishment, and at every discussion of the matter urged that, there having been a marriage, there was no remedy but to make it public. To show how little offended he was personally, he was most gracious in his manner toward him and very soon afterwards bestowed on him a present of £20,000 and a barony.

A visit to London of the Princess of Orange caused a temporary silence at Court over the affair, though a rumour was industriously spread about the town that the business was broken off, "the Duke being resolved never to think more of it." Further it was reported "that the Duke had discovered some disloyalty in the lady, which he had never suspected, but had now so full evidence of it that he was resolved never more to see her; and that he was not

married. And all his family, whereof the Lord Berkley and his nephew were the chief, who had long hated the Chancellor, spake very loudly and scandalously of it."*

Further trouble arose with the arrival in England of Queen Henrietta Maria. The Princess Mary could not have been expected to look with pleasure on the admission of a commoner's daughter to the Royal circle. But she was at least personally friendly to Anne Hyde. With the Queen, on the other hand, this was not the case. As early as July 15th, 1655,

* John Berkeley, knighted by Charles I., was appointed Governor to the Duke of York in exile at Paris and succeeded in gaining his pupil's affection, as we have seen in the last chapter. Having refused to allow Sir John to be removed from his household in Flanders, James persuaded the King in 1658 to make him Baron Berkeley of Stratton. On the Restoration he was appointed Comptroller. Pepys describes him as "the most hot, fiery man in discourse, without any cause, that ever I saw." (*Diary*, December 3rd, 1664.) Hyde says of him: "If he loved anyone it was those whom he had known a very little while, and who had purchased his affection at the price of much application and very much flattery; and if he had any friends, they were likewise those who had known him very little." (*Clarendon State Papers*, III., Supp., p. 80.) We shall meet with Lord Berkeley again. We must suppose him to have had some redeeming points of which his critics do not tell us. His nephew Charles is even more severely handled by some of his contemporaries, and what we hear of him in this chapter is certainly disgraceful enough. Some of the comments upon his character may be found in *My Lady Castlemaine*, p. 80 and footnote. To supplement King Charles's testimonial to him there might have been quoted James's remark: "The Earl of Falmouth in the highest favour [in 1663], minding his master's, not his own, concerns. He was killed at sea, and died not worth a farthing, though not expensive." (*James's Memoirs* in Macpherson's *Original Papers*, I., 24.) And Henrietta, Duchess of Orleans, writing to her brother Charles on June 22nd, 1665, says: "I cannot end without expressing my sorrow at the death of poor Lord Falmouth, whom I regret as much for the sake of the friendship you felt for him, which he so justly deserved, as for his goodness to me. Indeed, I had to weep with all my heart for him, on the very day the news of your victory gave me the greatest joy."

Hyde writes from Cologne to Lady Stanhope concerning his "poor girl" and the Queen's "old dislike" of her. Henrietta Maria never disguised her hatred for Hyde himself, and it may have been merely on his account that she was unkind to his daughter. But, whatever the reason, James could have no doubt as to how his mother regarded Anne. When she heard the report of the marriage she wrote to him in deep anger—she was wont to express herself strongly at such times—to reproach him for having fallen so low, and threatened to come over in person to prevent so great a stain and dishonour to the Crown. James quailed before her, and, when she fulfilled her threat and reached England in November, he went so far as to deny his marriage, or at least its validity. As a matter of fact, as early as September 3rd, he had fulfilled his promise at a secret wedding, which took place at Worcester House, the unsuspecting Chancellor's own residence! The reasons for haste were obvious when, on October 22nd, still at her father's house, Anne gave birth to a son. By the special desire of the King, the Marchioness of Ormonde, the Countess of Sunderland, and some other ladies were present at the event. The Bishop of Winchester was also at Worcester House, and to him Anne solemnly declared that she was married to the Duke. The ladies were convinced of her innocence, and Lady Ormonde went to the King and informed him so.

In spite of this, the enemies of the Hydes did not

relax their efforts. "And it was now avowedly said that Sir Charles Berkley, who was captain of his guard, and in much more credit and favour with the Duke than his uncle (though a young man of a dissolute life, and prone to all wickedness in the judgment of all sober men), had informed the Duke 'that he was bound in conscience to preserve him from taking to wife a woman so wholly unworthy of him; that he himself had lain with her; and that for his sake he would be content to marry her, though he knew well the familiarity the Duke had with her.' This evidence, with so solemn oaths presented by a person so much loved and trusted by him, made a wonderful impression on the Duke; and now confirmed by the commands of his mother, as he had been before prevailed upon by his sister, he resolved to deny that he was married, and never to see the woman again who was so false to him." Henrietta Maria expressed her satisfaction with James, and there was exultation among the foes of the Chancellor. The only hindrance to their joy was the King's persistent graciousness to his minister, "which," says Hyde, "made it evident that he believed nothing of what Sir Charles Berkley avowed, and looked on him as a fellow of great wickedness; which opinion the King was long known to have of him before his coming into England, and after." The correctness of the last statement we may take leave to deny; but His Majesty may well have

disbelieved the scandal without hating the scandal-monger.

Since the Princess Mary's arrival James had not spoken to his father-in-law. Now he asked for an interview. Obviously still very much under the influence of others, he remonstrated with him warmly. He had been informed that Hyde was shortly about to bring before Parliament evidence of the marriage. James threatened him that it would be the worse for him if he did so. As for his daughter, "she had behaved so foully (of which he had such evidence as was convincing as his own eyes, and of which he could make no doubt) that nobody could blame him for his behaviour toward her." Hyde made a dignified reply, denying any intention of bringing the matter before Parliament and saying that he was not concerned with the vindication of his daughter, which he would leave to God Almighty.

According to the *Continuation*, Hyde's ill-wishers had expected that his attitude would provoke indignation against him; but they were disappointed. "On the contrary, men of the greatest name and reputation spake of the foulness of the proceeding [to annul the marriage] with great freedom and with all the detestation imaginable against Sir Charles Berkley, whose testimony nobody believed." Queen Henrietta Maria did her utmost to keep the Duke to his resolution; but the Princess of Orange, falling a victim to smallpox (of which she died in December,

1660), "in her last agonies expressed a dislike of the proceedings in that affair, to which she had contributed too much."

The Duke now grew so melancholy and discontented that everyone noticed it, and at last Charles Berkeley, touched by conscience and by the distress of his master, came to him and confessed the falsity of his accusation, declaring that he had only acted out of pure devotion to the Duke and had tried to prevent a marriage which would be mischievous and inconvenient to him. He begged pardon for what he had done. "The Duke," says Hyde, "found himself so much relieved in that part that most afflicted him that he embraced him and made a solemn promise that he should not suffer in the least degree in his own affection for what had proceeded so absolutely from his good-will to him, and that he would take so much care of him in the compounding that affair that . . . he should receive no disadvantage."

After this remarkable scene with Berkeley James wrote to Anne that he would speedily visit her; and to the King, expressing his joy at the turn which affairs had taken. Berkeley apologized to Anne, who gave him a gracious reception. "He came likewise to the Chancellor with those professions that he could easily make; and the other was obliged to receive him graciously."

There only remained Henrietta Maria, who was

highly offended with her second son, and more bitter than ever against the Hydes. Recourse was had to diplomacy to convince her of the unwisdom of her conduct. As she was going back to Paris, it was suggested that her welcome at the French Court would be by no means warm if she left England on bad terms with the King and Duke and at enmity with the chief minister. She gave way and agreed to a reconciliation with her daughter-in-law and Hyde before she departed. So the affair which was to have effected the ruin of the Chancellor led only to an increase of his influence. In April, 1661, Charles gave a token of his great regard for him by creating him Earl of Clarendon. He would also have bestowed on him the Garter and 10,000 acres of Crown land, had not the Chancellor refused to accept these.

We have now had Hyde's version of the plot to ruin his daughter, wherein there is not one word of accusation against Talbot. The evidence being before us, it remains to see how Macaulay has dealt with it. In his sixth chapter, after mentioning Talbot's readiness for "the infamous service of assassinating the Protector," he goes on:

"Soon after the Restoration, Talbot attempted to obtain the favour of the royal family by a service more infamous still. A plea was wanted which might justify the Duke of York in breaking that promise of marriage by which he had obtained from Anne Hyde the last proof of female affection. *Such a plea Talbot,*

in concert with some of his dissolute companions, *undertook to furnish*. They agreed to describe the poor young lady as a creature without virtue, shame or delicacy, and made up long romances about tender interviews and stolen favours. *Talbot in particular related* how, in one of his secret visits to her, he had unluckily overturned the Chancellor's inkstand upon a pile of papers, and how cleverly she had averted a discovery by laying the blame of the accident on her monkey. These stories, which, if they had been true, would never have passed the lips of any but the basest of mankind, were pure inventions. *Talbot was soon forced to own that they were so; and he owned it without a blush*. The injured lady became Duchess of York. Had her husband been a man really upright and honourable, he would have driven from his presence with indignation and contempt the wretches who had slandered her. But one of the peculiarities of James's character was that no act, however wicked and shameful, which had been prompted by a desire to gain his favour, ever seemed to him deserving of disapprobation. Talbot continued to frequent the Court, appeared daily with brazen front before the Princess whose ruin he had plotted, and was installed into the lucrative post of chief pandar to her husband."

The last statement may be left alone for the present. With regard to the charge against Talbot of bearing false witness against Anne Hyde, it can be

seen that Macaulay not only takes the veracity of Gramont's account for granted, but introduces a few extra touches* to heighten the blackness of the picture. Of these extra touches, it is true, two are borrowed from Hyde's account, with this difference, that Hyde is speaking not of Talbot, but of Charles Berkeley. Such perversion of the evidence is characteristic of Macaulay's way of dealing with one whom he dislikes, particularly if he be a Jacobite. Much as Macaulay reprobates the judicial methods of Lord Jeffreys, he is singularly prone to imitate the Jeffreys manner when he sits in judgment upon a political opponent. And no one, except perhaps Talbot's master, James, receives unfairer treatment than Richard Talbot at the hands of this judge.

The truth of the whole matter is that there are two witnesses only in the case against the slanderers of Anne Hyde; the lady's own father, and either Gramont or Anthony Hamilton. Hyde, whose good faith we cannot impugn, does not implicate in the disgraceful business the man whose person and very

* Indicated by the italics in the above passage, which are of course ours, not Macaulay's. Gramont does not say that Talbot undertook to furnish the necessary plea for the Duke of York, but that Berkeley did so. Gramont does not make Talbot's the chief evidence; on the contrary, he calls Arran's, Talbot's and Jermyn's depositions "trivial" compared with Killigrew's (which is frankly disgusting). And, lastly, Gramont does not say that Talbot was forced to own that his story was a pure invention and that he did so without a blush. He speaks of no confession on the part of the conspirators. Hyde makes Berkeley undertake to furnish a plea, as we have seen, and afterwards confess that his story was false.

name he detested. Gramont, according to his fellow-countryman Cominges, was "the most bare-faced liar in the world," and the graces of style and the wit which Anthony Hamilton imparted to the *Memoirs* of his brother-in-law should not blind us to the fact that the work was designed to amuse—and often, we may suspect, to pay off old scores, like some notorious memoirs of the present day. Gramont was not in England at the time of Berkeley's plot. As for Anthony Hamilton, the year of his birth is fixed by some as late as 1646, which would make him only fourteen in the autumn of 1660. Even if he were a little older than this, he could not be looked upon as a first-hand authority on the occurrences of that period. Therefore the story in the *Memoirs* may be dismissed as mere gossip, unworthy to be considered for a moment beside an obviously genuine account.

Yet the vile charge against Richard Talbot is almost universally accepted. Why? Mr. Andrew Lang has, somewhere, well called the Muse of English history a "Whiggish Muse." And in the affairs of the Stuart period our historians have nearly all been content to follow the beaten track—beaten, chiefly, by the stately feet of Macaulay. Macaulay takes as trustworthy Gramont's tale against the man of whom he believed nothing too bad to be true. Therefore Talbot must be immortally branded as the infamous traducer of Anne Hyde. It would not be

necessary to dwell so insistently on this point in our story, were it not that no one down to the present day who has walked in the steps of Macaulay has considered it incumbent on himself to inquire whether, after all, the evidence on which Talbot has been convicted is enough to hang a dog.*

We may now turn to the statement that after the affair of Anne Hyde Talbot was "installed into the lucrative post of chief pandar to her husband," for which the support of Bishop Burnet and of the *Memoirs of Gramont* again is claimed. Burnet in one place speaks of "Richard Talbot, one of the Duke's bedchamber men, who had much cunning, and had the secret of his master's pleasures for some years." In another he says: "The Duke had always one private amour after another, in the managing of which he seemed to stand more in awe of the Duchess than, considering the inequality of their rank, could have been imagined. Talbot was looked on as the manager of those intrigues." Surely not much weight can be

* For instance, in Dr. R. H. Murray's *Revolutionary Ireland and its Settlement* (1911) it is simply stated that Talbot's "services were at the disposal of Charles II. and his brother James, then Duke of York. When the latter wanted to break his promise of marriage to Anne Hyde, Talbot undertook to blacken her character, and, on the failure of the attempt, it is astonishing to find that the Duke kept him as his friend" (pp. 52-3). Similarly, in *The English Court in Exile* (1911), by E. and M. S. Grew, it is said: "We need not be astonished to find that he [Talbot] was a boon companion in James's vices. The worst that can be said of him is that, when James was meditating a way of escape from the consequences of marrying his first wife, Anne Hyde, the Irishman allowed himself to be one of a party of four 'gentlemen of honour' instructed by Lord Falmouth to give personal testimony against her reputation" (p. 157).

attached to vague remarks like these from one who had such views of history as Burnet.*

Gramont is certainly more definite in his charge than Burnet, and at the risk of provoking the feelings aroused by *crambe repetita* we must give a brief abstract of the narrative concerning the Duke of York, the Carnegies, and Richard Talbot in the eighth chapter of the *Memoirs*. Robert Carnegie, son and heir to James, second Earl of Southesk, had married Anne, daughter of the loyal Duke of Hamilton who lost his life at the battle of Worcester. Anne Hamilton, friend in girlhood of Barbara Villiers, was already notorious before her marriage; but as she brought him £30,000, her husband perhaps did not at first inquire too closely into her character. After the Restoration the Duke of York was attracted by Lady Carnegie, as she was called. Gramont says that, having quieted his conscience by the declaration of his marriage with Anne Hyde, he "thought himself entitled by his generous effort to give way a little to his inconstancy"; and Lady Carnegie, "still tolerably

* In his *Reflections on the History of Mr. Varillas* Burnet says: "An historian that favors his own side is to be forgiven . . . and if he but slightly touche the failings of his friends, and severely aggravates those of the other side, though in this he departs from the laws of an exact historian, yet this bias is so natura that if it lessens the credit of the writer, yet it does not blacken him." Lord Ailesbury, in his *Memoirs*, remarks of Burnet, "As to the history of his own times, I could give him the lie as many times as there are pages in his book." It might perhaps have troubled Ailesbury to prove the numerical correctnes of his statement; but, speaking generally, he was justified in his language It is a sad example of how political views warp the standard of honesty that a scurrilous creature like Burnet, whose evil tongue and evil mind were a disgrac to his cloth, should be elevated to the position of a censor of his fellow-men.

handsome"—she was little over twenty!—was the first he could lay his hands upon. She was not obdurate. But Carnegie, who had been away in Scotland, lost his father suddenly and returned to London with the title of Earl of Southesk. He was informed of what had happened in his absence and now began to keep a strict watch upon his wife. The Duke, therefore, took the precaution of always calling in the company of a friend, for appearances' sake. One day Talbot, who had recently come back from Portugal, was the friend selected. "This connection had taken place in his absence, and, without knowing who Lady Southesk was, he had been told that his master was in love with her." The Duke took him into the house and introduced him to the lady, after which Talbot "thought it his duty to give His Royal Highness an opportunity to pay his compliments," and accordingly retired into the ante-room, which looked into the street, and sat looking out of the window at the passers-by. "He was on such occasions," remarks Gramont, "one of the best-meaning men in the world." A coach drove up to the door and a man got out and came upstairs. It was the new earl, who was much surprised to see Talbot carelessly lolling in his wife's ante-room; for the Duke had dismissed his coach, and Southesk was not aware that there were any visitors. Talbot had not met him since they were both in Flanders and, knowing him only as Carnegie, greeted him warmly by that name and asked him

what he was doing here. If he came to see Lady Southesk, he might go away again, for the Duke was now with her. Southesk was so confounded that he went downstairs again, got into his coach, and drove away. Talbot waited for the Duke's reappearance and, having told him what had occurred, "was very much surprised to find that the story afforded no pleasure to those who had the principal share in it."

Such is Gramont's account. There is not much that need be said about it. It is unfortunately true that the Duke of York had an intrigue with Lady Carnegie soon after the Restoration. (Creed tells Pepys in 1668 about her husband "finding her and the Duke of York, at the King's first coming in, too kind.") And as Talbot returned from Portugal in April, 1662, he might have found his master engaged in this discreditable affair then. But the whole tale falls to the ground for this reason, that the second Earl of Southesk did not die until the beginning of 1669, by which time the intrigue had long ago come to an end, to be followed by some very unpleasant rumours about the lady. We have here, therefore, a mere piece of invention on the part of Gramont or Hamilton. And this is the sole basis, apart from the two passages quoted above from Burnet, on which is built the most degrading accusation against Richard Talbot. Again we may ask whether the evidence is enough on which to hang a dog. Yet it has been accepted without hesitation, as far as we can see, by our historians.

CHAPTER VI

THE IRISH CHAMPION

NO more difficult problem awaited solution by Charles II. and his ministers after the Restoration than that of the settlement of Ireland. And no problem received more attention with less satisfactory results.* Charles inherited from his father and took over from the Commonwealth a task which it was probably beyond human skill to perform. The tangle of conflicting rights and wrongs would have defied the efforts of the most impartial justice to unravel it. Justice had hitherto played but little part in the composing of Irish affairs. That they should have been unable to see their way to an arrangement acceptable to all parties is not fair ground for censure of Charles's advisers. There was no such acceptable arrangement, and those who started with the best intentions in the world to find

* Edward Hyde, it may be noted, so well appreciated the hopelessness of the Irish settlement question that, as he says, he "made it his humble suit to the King, that no part of it might ever be referred to him." His son Henry was destined one day to recognise how great was his father's wisdom in the matter.

one were at last forced by sheer weariness to content themselves with putting expediency in the place of justice and bringing about a settlement which might at least be called a compromise, though one very unevenly balanced between the parties.

Towards the end of 1660 the government of Ireland was put in the hands of three Lord Justices pending the appointment of a Lord-Lieutenant in place of the absentee George Monk, Duke of Albemarle, who had accepted the post among many other gifts from his grateful sovereign, but valued his ease too much to care to take up the work. The King, having been furnished with a favourable estimate of the amount of land available in Ireland to be restored to the loyal natives after the settlers had been confirmed in their possessions, expressed his delight that it would be in his power to satisfy the interests of all his subjects. "His inclinations," as Carte says, "led him to make them all happy; and he eagerly embraced a scheme which flattered those inclinations." On November 30th, 1660, he signed a Declaration, in which he made promises to the Adventurers (who had formerly lent money in England on the credit of Acts of Parliament, receiving security in the shape of land in Ireland); to the soldiers settled by Cromwell; to the officers who had served in the army in Ireland previous to June 5th, 1649; to any Protestants, not being rebels, who had lost their land to soldiers or Adventurers; to

"innocent papists" who had taken land in Connaught in exchange for that of which they had been dispossessed; to those Irish who had faithfully served him abroad (such as Richard Talbot and the Dongans, for instance); and to thirty-six of the Irish nobility and gentry by name, hence known as the Nominees.

The King's amiable intentions were frustrated. The Adventurers' and soldiers' party, indeed, was satisfied. But the Irish were not, and made a great outcry. Particularly was offence taken over the question of "innocent papists." Commissioners had been appointed to carry out the Declaration, and in their instructions the qualifications of an innocent Papist were made very strict. There were numbers who had never drawn sword against the King, but, living in rebellious districts, had kept themselves apart from the rebels entirely; others who had actually been driven out of Dublin by the Lord Justices of the day on pain of death into the rebels' country, and still had not opposed the King. Yet they were, by the instructions to the Commissioners, not "innocent." In contrast to them, Cromwellian soldiers who had fought against the King were confirmed in the possession of the land assigned to them, unless actually regicides or notoriously disloyal.

Again, it was soon found that the stock of land available for distribution was at an end; the hardship falling on the Irish, whose restoration to their estates was to follow the "reprisal" elsewhere of the

dispossessed Adventurers and soldiers. An official protest, however, was impossible. In the Irish House of Commons at the time the Roman Catholics were not represented at all. The Corporations of the towns having been filled by Cromwell to his own liking, the Adventurers' and soldiers' party was in a great majority. These arrogated to themselves the name of "the English interest" and designated the settlers who had preceded them as mere "Irish." Nothing would have pleased them better than to drive the earlier colonists out of the island. The older Protestant proprietors, however, though a small minority in the Lower House, were the more influential in the Upper, and had means of self-defence which the Roman Catholics had not.

When the question of interpreting the Royal Declaration arose the Adventurers and soldiers wished for a literal interpretation, which would put them in the same position as the greatest loyalists. They hurried a draft Bill of Settlement through the House of Commons and decided to send commissioners to the King and Privy Council in England to press for its immediate passing into law. To back their commissioners' endeavours they raised a sum of between twenty and thirty thousand pounds amongst themselves. The Lords also sent agents to London to present their views, and on the prorogation of the Irish Parliament on July 31st, 1661, the scene of the struggle shifted to England.

If the Irish Roman Catholics, both of the Pale and outside, were at a disadvantage in their own land through the control of their enemies over Parliament, they were still worse placed when the fight was transferred to London. They had no abundance of funds at their command like the Adventurers and soldiers. They could count but a scanty number of friends at Court, where few Papists had even as high a position as Richard Talbot; and public opinion was prejudiced against them, not merely on account of their religion, but also as being Irish. The rebellion and the massacres of 1641 had not been forgotten, nor would be for many more years to come.

In such a plight their best step was to secure as powerful a patron as possible. The ideal man, had they been wise enough to moderate their demands, would have been Ormonde. He was admirably fitted by blood and interests to negotiate between the English and the Irish. James Butler could trace his descent to a grandchild of Edward I., and one Queen of England, Anne Boleyn, was great-grandchild to Thomas, seventh Earl of Ormonde. Though he had an English mother and had been brought up at the English Court, he had great estates and a host of kinsmen and dependents in Ireland, where the Butlers had been since the time of the first conquest. Himself a Protestant, he was the only one in his immediate family circle, and yet he was on good

terms with his brothers and sisters.* He was sympathetic with the Roman Catholic nobility and gentry of Ireland, far more than with the later settlers, and, as we have seen, had fought side by side with them when the struggle between England and Ireland had changed to one between Royalists and Parliamentarians.

Of his great influence now at the age of fifty-one there could be no doubt, especially when Charles II. in the spring of 1661 bestowed on him such tokens of his esteem as an Irish Dukedom and the Lord High Stewardship of England. But, with all his qualifications and inclinations to be of service to them, Ormonde was not allowed by the Irish Roman Catholics to help them. Persuaded of their own merits and their claims on the royal favour, they took high ground and claimed, if not much more than was just, at least more than it was reasonable to expect at a period when the English Parliament had forced the King to break the liberal promises of

* Writing to Sir Robert Southwell on November 30th, 1678, Ormonde says: "My father and mother lived and died Papists, and bred all their children so, and only I, by God's merciful providence, was educated in the true Protestant religion. . . . My brothers and sisters, though they were not very many, were very fruitful and very obstinate (they will call it constant) in their way. Their fruitfulness hath spread into a large alliance, and their obstinacy has made it altogether Popish. . . . But I am taught by nature and also by instruction that difference in opinion concerning matters of religion dissolves not the obligations of nature; and in conformity to this principle I own not only that I have done, but that I will do, my relations of that or any other persuasion all the good I can." (*H.M.C. Reports, Ormonde MSS.*, II., Old Series.) For a very favourable report on Ormonde by an English Roman Catholic, see Carte, *Original Letters found among the Duke of Ormond's Papers*, II., 63-4.

his declaration from Breda. Ormonde was a Protestant and would not—indeed, could not—go as far as they wished to go. Moreover, so far from attempting to conciliate him, they did their best to drive him into opposition against them. Carte's explanation of this mistaken policy seems reasonable. He says that the Irish now in London included very many who had formerly belonged to Rinuccini's party and who still cherished their hatred for Ormonde. They considered that they had purged their former offence of rebellion by the military service which they had done with the other Irish in Flanders, and now claimed to be most deserving loyalists.

In their hostility to the Duke of Ormonde these men looked about for someone to plead their cause, through whom they could at the same time strike at him. They settled upon Richard Talbot, although he had belonged to the section of the Confederates which had resisted the Nuncio. Carte says that Talbot had been careful not to damage himself up to now by favouring the Roman Catholics, which was a point that Sir Nicholas Plunket and the other Irish agents took into consideration in choosing him as their patron. "His vanity and zeal," he continues, "made him forward to undertake everything; as his enmity to the Duke of Ormonde, whom he had injured, and the habit he had contracted of railing against him, moved him to render His Grace's friendly and wise advice to the agents suspected."

It is difficult to reconcile Richard Talbot's later professions of regard for Ormonde and his continued friendship with Ormonde's sons, Ossory and Arran, with his conduct now, for which we do not have to depend on Carte's account alone. We can only suppose that his very impulsive nature led him, in his advocacy of the case of his countrymen and co-religionists, to greater lengths than he realised himself. There was already a soreness between him and Ormonde over the affair of the lieutenant-colonelcy in the Duke of York's Regiment. Now he threw himself whole-heartedly into the campaign against one whom he had called "the patron of us all." Besides, another failing of his came into play. Carte says: "The vanity of appearing considerable and making himself popular induced him to espouse the cause of these men and to join with them and his brothers in openly bespattering the Duke of Ormonde with all the calumnies imaginable and treating the Chancellor with satirical reflections not easy to be digested." In the case of Hyde, or, as we must now call him, Clarendon, there was little reason for the Talbots to spare him, particularly as he was now very hostile to the Irish claims. But gratitude should have induced them to treat Ormonde better.*

* Even Sir Robert seems to have been estranged, at least for a time. Clarendon says that Ormonde had recommended him to the King as a person fit for his favour, but because he did not ask everything on his behalf "this refusal was looked on as the highest disobligation." (*Continuation*, III., 117.)

So disgusted was Ormonde, "seeing that his advice would not be followed and that his character was every day torn in pieces by some or other of their country," that he refused to take a prominent part in the adjustment of the Bill of Settlement, and until his appointment as Lord-Lieutenant, in November, 1661, confined his activity in Irish affairs to helping his personal friends and giving certificates of good behaviour on behalf of those Irish whose loyalty was unjustly questioned.

Richard Talbot's influence was unavailing to help his clients, who indeed ruined their own chances. While insisting on their personal fidelity, they violently attacked those who had formerly taken the Parliamentary side. They spoke of them as if they had all been regicides, provoking the obvious retort that they themselves had been guilty of the 1641 massacres, and had attempted to put Ireland under foreign domination. They offended the Privy Councillors, before whom they had to plead; for the Council included several Commonwealth men. They alienated the King, in spite of his secret Roman Catholic sympathies and his desire to please all he could, in Ireland as elsewhere, by insistence on their rights and his duties. They threatened him with a charge of breach of faith if he did not observe the terms of the treaty of 1648. Charles was not a man to be treated in this way; and the Adventurers' and soldiers' representatives knew better than to act so, being effusive in their

protestations of loyalty and submission. The result was what was to be expected. Charles declared himself in favour of the maintenance of an "English interest" in Ireland, which, as Carte says, "showed the Irish plainly enough who were likely to be the sufferers" from the lack of land to go round. Policy carried the day.

So unsuccessful were the Irish agents that they could not even obtain a modification of the qualifications of "innocent papists," the most unjust point in the Instructions given to the commissioners appointed to execute the King's Declaration. They vented their mortification over this in a fresh attack on Ormonde, whom they accused of persuading the King against them, or at least of not using his influence at the Privy Council to save them from injustice. Their champion was called upon to do something for them. So, in Carte's words, "Colonel Talbot went to expostulate with him [Ormonde] upon the matter. He came in so huffing a manner, and used such impertinent and insolent language in his discourse, that it looked like a challenge; and His Grace, waiting upon His Majesty, desired to know if it was his pleasure that at this time of day he should put off his doublet to fight duels with Dick Talbot."

However strong Talbot's influence might be with the Duke of York, the provocation of a Privy Councillor to a duel could not be overlooked by a King

who was steadfastly opposed to all duelling at his Court. Charles ordered the offender to be sent to the Tower, apparently some time in October, 1661. This was the first time Talbot went to the Tower on account of Ormonde, but not the last. He did not now stay there long, however, but, having duly offered his submission, was released. Ormonde could indeed afford to disregard him. In council, on November 4th, he was declared Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. Albemarle had persuaded the King to appoint him his successor and Ormonde to accept the post. Clarendon, who had not been consulted, and was annoyed at being deprived of the support of his friend in English affairs, frankly told Charles that he would do very ill in sending Ormonde to Ireland and Ormonde that he would do much worse if he desired to go. But this failed to produce an alteration of the decision. Ormonde, it was true, could not yet be spared from England, but his appointment stood, the Lords Justices remaining in control of Irish affairs until he should cross to Dublin.

Although the Settlement of Ireland was far from being effected yet, Richard Talbot's active interest in it was temporarily checked by the punishment which he had brought upon himself by his indiscretion. With or without him, the cause which he had embraced was lost when, before the Privy Council one day, Sir Nicholas Plunket was suddenly confronted with his signature on a document authorising the

offer of Ireland in 1647, first to the Pope, and if he should refuse, then to any Roman Catholic prince willing to protect her. Plunket was banished from Court, all further addresses from Roman Catholics to the Council were forbidden, and the Bill of Settlement, with the clauses to which the Irish so much objected, received the royal assent. The only cause for Irish congratulation was that the King appointed a good solid commission to administer the Act,* including Sir Winston Churchill, future father-in-law of Sarah Jennings.

On his release from the Tower, perhaps to soothe his injured pride and no doubt through the influence of the Duke of York, Talbot was sent on a small diplomatic mission to Portugal. This is the mission of which we hear in Gramont, who says that Talbot "was so subject to forgetfulness and absence of mind that he once left behind him in London a complimentary letter which the Duke had given him for the Infanta of Portugal, and never recollected it until he was going to his audience." It would be interesting to know what Talbot did when he found that he had not the letter. The oversight was rather grave, seeing that the said Infanta was soon to be Queen of England.

Talbot's return home is fixed by Pepys, in the only

* "All men of good parts, learned in the laws, and clear in their reputation for virtue and integrity," says Carte. The offence which they gave to the soldiers' party, by the number of "innocent papists" whom they admitted, is a testimony to their impartiality.

entry in the *Diary* which mentions him. Under the date April 10th, 1662, he says: "Yesterday came Col. Talbot with letters from Portugal that the Queen is resolved to embarque for England this week." Catherine's start from Lisbon was delayed, however, and it was not until May 21st that the marriage took place. It does not appear where Talbot was at the time of the royal wedding. As the Duke of Ormonde stayed for it and did not leave to take up his Lord-Lieutenancy until early July, it is possible that Talbot thought it best to avoid meeting him for a time, and therefore went to his relatives in Ireland.* Anyhow, we know that he was in Dublin in the autumn of the year, for two letters written by him there survive to prove it. In one, dated September 30th, he says that he hears his brother Peter is under the King's displeasure. It is reported that either Peter or he had said that he (the writer) was often "employed by the King to Lady Castlemaine." He denies having discoursed with the Queen about the matter. The second letter, dated November 20th, also refers to the King and Lady Castlemaine.

Richard obviously resented being accused of having informed Catherine—possibly while he was at Lisbon on his mission—that he had acted as a go-between

* Since the above was written, I have discovered an entry in the *Calendar of Treasury Books*, 1660-67, which shows Talbot to have been in England as late as July: "1662. July 21st. Warrant for Treasurer Southampton to Customs Commissioner for Colonel Richard Talbott to ship a coach and ten horses and six trunks for Ireland, he being commanded by the Duke of York to go thither."

from the King to the royal mistress, like Charles Berkeley. Now as Catherine expressly told Clarendon, when he came to her at Hampton Court to persuade her to accept Lady Castlemaine as Lady of the Bedchamber, that she did not think, when she arrived in England, to find the King engaged in his affections to another lady, the accusation was no doubt unjust. But the Talbots were out of favour again at this time. Through the friendship of the Duke of York they had managed to live down the ill reports against them before the Restoration and to enjoy their share in the sunshine of the Court. The Chancellor, however, continued their unrelenting foe, and struck when he could. With regard to Richard, Clarendon says himself that he "had sometimes at the council-table been obliged to give him severe reprehensions and often desired the Duke [of York] to withdraw his countenance from him." As for the Jesuit, who to his indignation "walked with the same or more freedom in the King's house (and in the clergy habit) than any of His Majesty's chaplains did," Clarendon "declared very loudly" against him. Father Peter's efforts to conciliate him by letters and through the medium of friends were unavailing. Once he so far prevailed with the King that Peter was "forbid the Court." The same fate befell the friar, of whom Clarendon complained that he saw him too often in the galleries of Whitehall, and sometimes drunk there.

Peter's disgrace, if this be the same occasion to which Clarendon refers, was not solely due to the Chancellor's representations. After Henry Bennet had persuaded Charles to forgive him for his dubious conduct in connection with the Treaty of Fuentarabia, and to allow him to frequent the Court, he managed in 1662 to secure for himself the post of almoner to the young Queen. "His busy nature did not suffer him to continue long in that post," says Carte; "he was always telling the Queen some story or other, and the uneasiness which she suffered in October, 1662, upon Lady Castlemaine's being put about her, was imputed in a good measure to his insinuations." (Richard's two letters from Dublin confirm Carte here.) Once he said to Catherine that the lady was an enchantress, speaking in Spanish, which was the only other language besides Portuguese that she understood at present. The simple, ill-educated girl took the remark literally and cautioned the King against the sorceress. The puzzled Charles took the trouble to get to the bottom of the affair, and, finding that the Jesuit had once more been officious, banished him from Whitehall—no doubt with the hearty approbation of the Chancellor.

After making a vain effort to get himself reinstated, Father Peter crossed over to Ireland, where he discovered that his young brother had been by no means idle since they had parted. An opportunity for making money had come his way, and from this he was no

more averse than most other men of his time. Th
Irish House of Commons had drawn up and trans
mitted to England a Bill of Explanation, designed t
make clear the meaning of the King's Declaratio
of November, 1660. Among other things the Bi
endeavoured to "make provision for eminent an
deserving persons who were cut off from all manne
of relief by the power of the Court of Claims bein
determined." This Court of Claims had been se
up to investigate the pretensions of the "innocen
papists" who wished to come under the Declaratio
The Court's commission, however, only extende
down to August 22nd, 1662, by which time out o
four thousand claims entered not more than fou
hundred had been heard.

Now there was a great opportunity, both durin
the sitting of the Court of Claims and in connectio
with the Bill of Explanation, for a man of influenc
to make money. However conscious of their ow
innocence great numbers of the Irish Roman Catholi
were, they were aware of the difficulty of their restor
tion to their estates if they relied on that alone. S
many of them were willing to give bonds at least f
payment in event of their successful restoration. F
the insertion of provisos in the Bill some gave pr
mises of as much as £800, £1,000, or even more. C
course they expected to secure very influential patro
for such prices, but there were plenty of well-know
men ready to undertake the work. Indeed, they ha

heir agents employed in looking out for clients in reland. Among those thus selling their influence vere the old Earl of St. Albans, one of whose protégés vas the afterwards famous Patrick Sarsfield of Lucan; Sir Charles Berkeley, Sir Gilbert Gerard, Lord Carlingford, and Sir Audley Mervyn, Speaker of the Irish House of Commons and spokesman of the "English nterest" party before the Privy Council recently.

None had more dealings in this scandalous traffic han Richard Talbot, says Carte. His credit with he Duke of York was well known, and he was supposed o be great at Court, which procured him an infinite umber of clients—so many in fact that some, after pplying to him, went elsewhere for a patron, thinking that he was engaged on behalf of too many to give he necessary attention to their particular business.

In addition to this work for the dispossessed Irish, here was a great opportunity for making money hrough commissions from Englishmen wanting estates n Ireland at the smallest possible cost to themselves. Henry Bennet, now Secretary of State, was one of hose who entrusted Talbot with a "job" of this ind, and there are letters among the Irish State Papers of the period which show that Talbot exerted imself strenuously to earn his money. The King had ranted Bennet the reversion of the forfeited property f Viscount Clanmalier, but there were others in ossession, and the difficulty was to effect a compromise vith them. This Talbot was able to do in 1665, but

we do not hear what was his reward. He also endeavoured to interest the Secretary in another affair. "I am promised," he writes to him on March 25th, 1663, "a discovery of a great sum—£10,000—to be got here, and hope to be able to send particulars by next post. The discoverer only desires a third. You may have the rest, and treat me as you will." We may be sure that Bennet was nothing loth to hear of this discovery, nor of another matter which Talbot reveals to him on April 28th. The Jesuits are alarmed about the security of their mortgages in Ireland, and have made them all over to Talbot, desiring him to get a grant from the King for them. "You and I are to have half, about £4,000, and they the other half. It's good money: therefore pray despatch it."*

Altogether Talbot spent his time in Ireland, whether it was virtual exile or not, to his great profit. In the summer of 1663 he returned to England to prosecute the work which he had undertaken, carrying with him £18,000 in bonds and other securities from fellow-countrymen desirous of restoration to their estates.

Things did not go smoothly, however, for the "undertakers," as they were called. The King and

* In this same letter is an amusing reference to the activities of Peter Talbot. "I find," says Richard, "Don Pedro hath been too free in talking there [in London], as if I intended to take a wife. If I had a fortune and did think of one, I could not dispose of myself better than where he proposes. *Pero, Señor, no estoy yo aun para cassar me, no tengo mucho el cassamiento en la cabeza.* [But, Sir, I am not one to marry myself, I have little thought of marriage in my head.]"

the Privy Council, on examining the Irish Bill of Explanation, entirely disapproved of it, and orders were sent to Ormonde and the Council in Dublin to draw up a new Bill for transmission to England. Richard wrote from London to his brother Peter, whom he had left behind him, that "the King had resolved in council not to leave the obliging of his subjects to any minister, and the Lord-Lieutenant only proposed to restore about thirty of the Irish nation." This was an over-statement of the case, but the writer was doubtless labouring under feelings of disappointment.

We do not know on how good terms Richard Talbot had been with Ormonde in Ireland after the Lord-Lieutenant's arrival in July, 1662. In one of his communications to Bennet he mentions that he has had an hour's private converse with Ormonde at the Castle about the Clanmalier estate, and the interview, as reported by him, was peaceful and even genial. After his return to London he wrote a curious letter to Ossory, with whom at least he seems always to have maintained friendly relations. (Seeing how high stands the character of "the Bayard of the Restoration," by the general consent of his contemporaries,* this is certainly a point in Talbot's favour.) The letter is preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and is interesting as an example of the writer's style, apart from the light which it throws upon his sentiments

* His only vice was gambling, if we may believe Carte.

towards Ormonde and Ossory. The principal part of it is as follows:

"Whytehall, Oct. 13th, 1663.

"Yrs. of the 16th of the laste came unto my hands but Saterday night laste, and by this doe make you my humble acknowledgments for concerneing yrselfe soe perticularly in yr. serv^ts concernes as you seem to doe. I never expected less from you; nor I hope will never deserve less.

"When I gave you the troble of my first letter truely it was to the end you shoulde speake to my Lord Duke of the whole perticulers I had writ to you, for I know hee last writ to S^r George Hamilton what I writ to you, and I know hee would not have writ to him what hee did if hee had not beene misinformed by som malitious tonges that doe make it thyr busines to doe people ill offices because they have practiced it all thyr leives. You may easily guess *who* I suspect to have done mee this good turne, hee did me just such another a little before I came away from thence. I am sure I could render him laparreye [*la pareille*] very justly and saye nothing but the truth, but hee is so despicable a person (though a great one) that I swear unto you I doe pitty him.

"My Lord, I have often repeated an ould Spanish proverb to you, and that is *La meyor politica es la verdad*, and nothing is more true; whearfore I would now so farr put that in practise at this time that I would desier

you to knowe of yr. father upon what grounds hee did express his dissatisfaction to mee to yr. unkle Hamilton. It must bee that somone did mee good offices to him, and truely all that ever I asked his Grace for myself was that hee would tell myself of any thing hee tooke ill from mee, and hee was pleased to promise mee hee woulde. I knowe I doe not want enemyes thear that perhaps will buss in his earres upon every occation the worst things they can of mee, and if it shall be in the power of such little flutterers to doe honest men ill offices I knowe noe gentleman safe. . . .

"My Lord, you know as much of my soule as any man liveing. You may doe in this what you thinke best, and notwithstanding what you say to mee I knowe something sticks by him, but what it is God is my judge I know not.

"For what you say of my Lady Dutchess* being soe just to mee is that I never doubted, and I hope I may expect that from her Grace. I wear the unworthyest man liveing if I did not honor her as much as any creature in the world, haveing beene used so kindlye by her. I hope she doth not doubt it. . . ."

It is not as easy for us as for Ossory to guess who is the "despicable person (though a great one)" suspected

* Elizabeth Preston, a cousin of Ormonde's, whose parents had been at serious dispute with the Butlers over the Ormonde estates in Ireland; James I. espousing the cause of his favourite, Preston, created by him Earl of Desmond. When left an orphan Elizabeth became a royal ward, and her secret marriage in 1629 with her cousin, then only Viscount Thurles, gave great displeasure to Charles I. It was, however, a happy union.

by Talbot of having misrepresented him to the Duke of Ormonde. His affected ignorance of the cause of Ormonde's dissatisfaction with him is amusing, in view of the incident which only two years before had occasioned his imprisonment in the Tower. Having himself a short memory, he seems to have expected the Duke to have the same. And, as a matter of fact, Ormonde was not of a nature to cherish grudges. Clarendon once told him, with his refreshing frankness, that he and King Charles suffered from the same infirmity, "an unwillingness to deny any man what they could not but see was impossible to grant, and a desire to please everybody, which whosoever affected should please nobody."

The work of the Royal Commission on the details of the Irish Settlement dragged on slowly. At the beginning of November, 1663, the commissioners returned from Ireland. On the 3rd of that month, Arthur Annesley, Earl of Anglesey, wrote to Ormonde from London: "Dick Talbot's coach with six horses went yesterday to meet the commissioners and bring them this day to town, upon notice whereof one jested they might have come on foot before an English coach would have been sent to meet or fetch them." This coach of Talbot's seems to have been rather celebrated, for we hear of it on various occasions—as when Sir Nicholas Armorer in 1668 writes to Sir Joseph Williamson returning to London from the country: "You may come through in a day if met by Dick

Talbot's coach at St. Albans, but you must send orders to bespeak it."

Talbot, therefore, was not neglecting the interests of his Irish clients, for it was most important to conciliate the royal commissioners, in whom rested so much power over the fortunes of the "innocent papists." His hands were certainly not clean in the matter of his championship of his fellow-Irishmen, and Macaulay is at least justified in saying that he "took care, when pleading the cause of his countrymen whose estates had been confiscated, to be well paid." With a mixture of truth and gross injustice, Macaulay goes on to state that Talbot "succeeded in acquiring, partly by the sale of his influence, partly by gambling, and partly by pimping, an estate of three thousand pounds a year." A gambler he undoubtedly was, like many other men—Ossory, for instance—who play a not unworthy part in history. The lack of grounds for the third, and most unpleasant, accusation we have seen in the last chapter.

The *Memoirs of Gramont* draw a picture of Richard Talbot about this period which may perhaps be taken as Gramont's personal verdict upon him, since the Count was at the English Court on his first visit, from the time of the royal marriage to nearly the end of 1664. If so, the Chevalier considers Talbot no mere money-grubber. "There was no man at Court who had a better appearance," the *Memoirs* say. "He was, indeed, but a younger brother, of a

family which, though very ancient, was not very considerable, either for its renown or its riches. Yet, though he was naturally of a very careless disposition, being bent, however, on making his fortune, and much in favour with the Duke of York, and fortune likewise being propitious to him at play, he had improved both so much that he was in possession of about 40,000 *livres* [£2,000] a year in land." *

* It should be noticed that Marshal Berwick, who as a young man knew Richard Talbot in his old age only, says in his *Memoirs* (I., 103-4): "Although he had acquired great property, it could not be said that it was by ill means; for he never seemed greedy for money." Berwick is accused of being unduly favourable to Talbot. On the other hand, those who paint him as dishonest and grasping were certainly unduly prejudiced against him. Talbot's desire for money was that of an intensely ambitious, not of a grasping and miserly, man.

PART III

WHITEHALL

CHAPTER I

THE HAMILTONS

ON his return to London from Ireland with his valuable collection of bonds, Richard Talbot took up his duties again in the household of the Duke of York, where he was soon to meet the future partner of his honours and misfortunes. But the little Frances Jennings did not make her appearance at Court until some time after his return, and his attentions were at first attracted elsewhere. Or perhaps we should say his honourable attentions, if the *Memoirs of Gramont* are to be believed when they make Talbot offer himself to Elizabeth Hamilton with his fortune of 40,000 *livres*, "together with the almost certain hopes of being made a peer of the realm by his master's credit; and, over and above all, as many sacrifices as she could desire of Lady Shrewsbury's letters, pictures, and hair—curiosities which, indeed, are reckoned as nothing in housekeeping, but which testify strongly to the sincerity and merit of a lover." The notorious Anna Maria Brudenel, daughter of the second Earl of

Cardigan —" this beauty less famous for her conquests than for the misfortunes which she occasioned," as the *Memoirs* rightly say—had married the Earl of Shrewsbury* the year before the Restoration and after it had soon made herself conspicuous at Whitehall. Gramont mentions among her admirers, besides Talbot, Ormonde's son Arran, Captain Thomas Howard (brother of the Earl of Carlisle), the younger Jermyn, Harry Killigrew—and, of course, the Duke of Buckingham. With regard to her hair, there were " three or four gentlemen who wore an ounce of it made into bracelets."

This intrigue with Lady Shrewsbury, it may be noted, is the only one actually reported against Richard Talbot during his whole life, although another is implied by the existence of an illegitimate son.† Even if both cases be considered proved, the record is sufficiently remarkable for a handsome and popular young man at a period of such licence. His suit to Miss Hamilton was perfectly honest, as, indeed, it was bound to be to one who was above reproach in matters where her sex so failed at the Court of Charles II.

The Hamiltons were a remarkable family, of whom we shall hear much in the course of this book, so that we may conveniently stop to speak of them here. Sir George Hamilton married a sister of the future Duke of Ormonde, Mary Butler, a Roman Catholic like all

* Francis Talbot, eleventh Earl, a very distant connection of the Irish Talbots.

† See pp. 518, 588 below.

her family except Ormonde and like her husband himself. Sir George was the fourth son among the nine children of James Hamilton, favourite of James I., who, after the union of England and Scotland, made him Earl of Abercorn and gave him estates in Tipperary, which were settled on his younger sons. James Hamilton was a grandson of James, second Earl of Arran, Duke of Châtelherault in France, and, as "second person of the realm of Scotland," Regent during the minority of Mary Queen of Scots; so that, as far as nobility was concerned, Sir George was no less well descended than the Butlers with whom he intermarried, and the young Hamiltons had some of the best Scottish and Irish-Norman blood in their veins.

Sir George was faithful to the royalist cause. Although arrested as a Papist in 1641, during a visit to England, sent to the Tower, and deprived of his commission in the army, after his release on bail he crossed over to Ireland and took up arms under his brother-in-law the Lord-Lieutenant. For some reason, when the rebel leader Owen O'Neil took Roscrea, Tipperary, the home of the Hamiltons, in September, 1646, and put the inhabitants to the sword, he spared Lady Hamilton and her young family—to which act of clemency we owe, incidentally, the *Memoirs of Gramont*, Anthony being then but newly born. After the English Parliament's triumph, Sir George did not immediately follow Ormonde out of Ireland, staying to pass his accounts as Receiver-

General, a post to which he had been appointed in 1648. This he did, says Carte, "to the satisfaction of all parties, notwithstanding much clamour had been raised against him." In the spring of 1651 he took his family to Normandy and settled down temporarily with the Ormondes near Caen. Here all lived in great poverty and distress until, in the middle of 1652, Ormonde consented to his wife going to London, where she obtained from Cromwell a grant of £2,000 a year out of the estates of her husband and herself in Ireland. The secret of Lady Ormonde's influence with the Protector we do not know. She was a woman of high character, and is said to have inspired him with great respect. But her husband was the King's right hand,* and his dealings with the Royalists remaining in England were well known to Cromwell. Lady Ormonde took no share in any plot, to our knowledge; but, whether or not her residence in London was at last considered inconvenient, before the end of 1655 she retired to Ireland accompanied by her younger children.

The Hamiltons moved with Ormonde to Paris. Sir George, however, was seldom at rest from mission on behalf of the King, of which evidence may be found among the vast collection of Ormonde manuscripts surviving to this day. An interesting letter is one sent by Ormonde to Lord Jermyn in February, 1652

* Down to the time of the Restoration Ormonde was certainly this—and a considerable part of the brain of the royalist party as well.

"Sir George Hamilton," he writes, "goes toward you with all the recommendations from this to that Court [*i.e.*, from Charles's to Saint-Germain] that can be thought necessary. . . . He has made many expensive and dangerous voyages for the late and this King, and entirely lost his fortune by his faithfulness to them against the rebels of all their kingdoms, but his not going the last voyage he was designed for* and his attendance so long upon it will conclude his ruin if he prevail not in his pretensions to the French Court, or will cast him as a very unseasonable and unwilling burden upon His Majesty's care, who, God knows, had need to bestow it wholly upon himself."

Sir George was troubled not only by want of money, but also by the problem of finding some employment for his two elder sons, James and George—Frances Jennings's future first husband. Ormonde did what he could to help his brother-in-law in both difficulties. Before the move to Paris we find Hamilton writing to thank Ormonde for "your care to place my son George in a condition that I hope may enable him to acknowledge it with better service than I have ever been in a condition to do you." As for James, he "begins early, as your Excellence is pleased to advertise me, of which I will be at care to prevent as I may, though I know nothing so like to prevail in that case as good counsel and some way of employing his time to divert idleness,

* Apparently the expedition planned to set out from St. Malo in August, 1651, which was abandoned after the battle of Worcester had ruined royalist hopes.

which is the greatest curse of that gentlemanly vice." The scheme to keep James out of mischief is revealed in the same letter. "You have been pleased to put the place of the Janedarme to a very probable condition of success, if the business do serve right," says Hamilton. But it seems as if the plan of making the young man one of the *gens d'armes*, or lifeguards, to the little King Louis was not immediately carried out, for three years later Sir George writes expressing the fear that Ormonde's care of his sons is heaping still more trouble upon him. "I hope you will see it so ordered as if the eldest, whose fancy is flown a little high, may through that passion set a higher value upon a good face and some quality of blood than upon a fortune, of which he stands much more in need at present; that in this case, I say, I hope you will provide that such an unhappiness in him, if it should fall out, might not prejudice the advantage may be made of this occasion for his second brother George."

Sir George Hamilton can scarcely be called a lucid writer. But it seems possible to gather that some love affair or matrimonial idea made James unwilling to fall in with the views of Ormonde and his father—and his mother, too, who wishes to "induce her son Jamie to lay hold of such a providence from God which is by your Lordship thought fit for him to embrace." If it were not that this was only 1654, we might imagine that it was already the attraction of Lord Culpepper's daughter which caused "Jamie" to be reluctant to

enter the French service, and so be cut off from proximity to his charmer. He succeeded in getting his way, helped, no doubt, by the estrangement of the exiled Charles from the French Court; for in October, 1659, his father writes to Hyde, describing as "a great cordial in this sad time" some information about his *two* sons and their master's favour towards them. Whenever it was that he first fell in love with his future wife, he allowed her to have a great influence upon him; and finally he gave up Roman Catholicism to espouse her. His mother's disgusted reply to Ormonde's announcement of the marriage still exists. She writes:

"I must confess I never was more afflicted or surprised then when I found in your leter the unworthyness of Jamy, who I know two well to beleeive from him that he had anny other motive to dislike the Religion he has left than that he could not profess it liveing soe great a libertine as he did and the assurance he did [? had] that it would be an obstacle to his mariage with M^rs^ Culpeper, for whom he had this unhapy affection about foure yeares agoe (as I can shew in his leters), and at that time did he resolve to become an apostate rather then not have her. He has a deare bargain of her if she be soe unfortunat as to be engaged to him, and I am confident she will never have much satisfaction in one that has forsaken God for her. I am most certaine it was noe aprehention of his being out of the way of salvation made him

thus base, he has no such tender conscience, as you will finde in a little tieme. I humbly begg your pardon for being thus bitter when I writ to you, and if I have sayd annything against your religion that may offend you it was not my intention. . . . God's will be don in all things. I am much troubled that I know not wheare S^r George is. I feare he will be sencible of this misfortun as it will drive him to som sicknes. Excuse me, I beg you, and beleeive that I shall never be other then

"Your ever affectionate Sister and most humble servant,

"Ma. Hamilton."*

George junior does not appear to have caused anxiety to his parents like his brother James. A post was found for him, through Ormonde's influence, as page of honour to King Charles, in which position he is mentioned to Thurloe by one of his spies in April, 1655, at Cologne. In it he continued down to the Restoration.

Of the four younger boys, Anthony, Thomas, Richard and John, we do not hear anything in these

* Letter of May 14th, 1660 (quoted in *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, II., 182, from the Carte Papers). The very change which grieved Mary Hamilton so much caused James to be looked on with benevolence by other good people. Hyde writes to Ormonde, November 1st, 1659: "Your nephew James . . . is a very honest, and I think a very pious young man, and will proceed with that wariness that you advise, tho' in the main he is fully resolved, and truly, I think, upon right principles, severed from passion or appetite." (Carte, *Original Letters*, I., 252.)

early days; and the same is the case with Elizabeth and her two sisters.

The great event of May, 1660, brought to the Hamiltons, if not wealth, at least a certain material prosperity to which they had long been strangers. Being very numerous, Gramont says, they lived in a large and commodious house near the Court. "The Duke of Ormonde's family was continually with them; and here persons of the greatest distinction in London constantly met." Of the sons, James obtained first the rangership of Hyde Park and then a place as groom of the bedchamber to the King, as well as a colonelcy of a foot regiment. George, having given up his post of page, and having received a retiring pension of £120 a year, was appointed to "the King's Owne Troope of Guards." In this, which may be called the first regiment of the present-day British Army, George Hamilton received his four shillings a day as one of the two hundred gentlemen troopers. His younger brothers seem similarly to have joined the ranks as time went on, except Thomas, who entered the navy.

Elizabeth Hamilton, although unattached to either of the royal households, quickly made her mark at the Court of Charles II. Her beauty was famous. Gramont describes her and Frances Stewart as the chief ornaments of that Court in its early days, and the glowing account of her charms at the beginning of the seventh chapter of his *Memoirs* is familiar to all

readers of the book. She was full of accomplishments,* and the only blots upon her character which can be discovered are her excessive love of practical joking (for this the *Memoirs* are sufficient evidence) and very great pride of race, both of which failings led her to be somewhat regardless of the feelings of others. Had her head been turned, it would have been no wonder; for not only did the Duke of York press attentions upon her for a time, but her honourable suitors included the Duke of Richmond, Henry Howard, afterwards Duke of Norfolk, Charles Berkeley, Harry Jermyn, Lord Arundel, the two Russells —John, son of the Duke of Bedford, and his nephew William—Richard Talbot and Gramont, who won her in spite of this distinguished competition.

Philibert, Comte de Gramont, when he arrived in England, was forty-one years of age. A reputed grandson of Henri IV., and, in any case, of high extraction, he had been a favourite at the French Court, until he was banished for making love to a young lady on whom Louis XIV. had previously smiled. With regard to the other sex he appears to have been, previous to his conquest of *la belle* Hamilton, a rather ineffectual Don Juan. But he evidently had the ability to make many male friends. He was recommended to Whitehall not merely by his gallantry and lively humour, but also by the fact that he had served under the Duke

* Dangeau in his *Journal* (I., 241) describes her as having "a most lively wit, the most extensive information, the greatest dignity, the utmost ease, and the most polished elegance at Court."

of York's idol, Turenne. The Hamiltons were among those who gave a warm welcome to the French visitor, and Gramont confesses not only to spending much time at their house, but to astonishment that he spent so much time elsewhere. He soon was on intimate terms with James and George. "He had a great esteem for the elder," according to the *Memoirs*, "no less esteem and far more friendship for his brother, whom he made the confidant of his passion for his sister." For he had soon fallen in love with Elizabeth, after a brief attachment to the more notorious beauty Mrs. Middleton. Cominges, in one of that series of surely the oddest communications ever sent by an ambassador to his royal master, tells Louis XIV. of the Chevalier's "very ridiculous affair." Gramont, it seems, bribed Mrs. Middleton's maid to carry a love-declaration to her mistress. The maid took both the bribe and the declaration to herself, and when the mistress heard of this she told Gramont to "keep quiet and look elsewhere." Cominges adds: "Gramont did not fail to take her at her word, and he is now, six months after his coming, in a fair way to marriage."*

* Cominges to Louis, August, 1663. In another letter to Louis, Cominges (who is far from being an admirer of Gramont) says: "As he has noticed that his age is becoming a great obstacle to all his imaginary pleasures, he has resolved to secure himself more solid ones by marrying. With this view he has cast his eyes on a beautiful young lady of the house of Hamilton, niece to the Duke of Ormonde, adorned with all the graces of virtue and nobility, but so little with mere material wealth that, according to those who give her most, she has none. I think that at first the Chevalier did not mean to go so far in this business, but, whether conversation has completed what beauty began, or the noise made by two rather troublesome brothers may have had something to do with it, certain it is that he has now declared himself publicly."

It is only in the *Memoirs of Gramont* that we hear of Richard Talbot as a candidate for the hand of Elizabeth Hamilton; and there is great difficulty in making Gramont's account fit in with the known facts of Talbot's career at this period. Yet we can hardly suppose that Gramont and his biographer invented the story of his pretensions, however inaccurate they may have been in the details. We are told that Gramont looked on Talbot as a rival not to be despised and "thought him the more dangerous as he perceived that he was desperately in love; that he was not one to be discouraged by a first repulse; that he had too much sense and good breeding to draw upon himself either contempt or coldness by too great eagerness." And, besides this, his brothers began to frequent the Hamiltons' house—the one "an intriguing Jesuit and a great match-maker";* the other "what was called a lay-monk, who had nothing of his order but the immorality and infamy of character which is ascribed to them, and withal frank and free and sometimes entertaining, but always as ready to speak bold and offensive truths as to do good offices."

On the whole Gramont found good reason for uneasiness over Talbot's competition with him for his lady's favour. "Nor was the indifference which Miss Hamilton showed for the addresses of his rival sufficient to remove his fears; for, being absolutely

* This agrees well with what is said of "Don Pedro" in Richard Talbot's letter of April 28th, 1663, to Bennet.

dependent on her father's will, she could only answer for her own intentions."

But, according to the *Memoirs*, Fortune, who seemed to have taken Gramont under her protection in England, now delivered him from all uneasiness. Then we get the story of Talbot's quarrel with Ormonde over Irish affairs and his imprisonment in the Tower. "By this imprudent conduct he lost all hopes of marrying into a family which, after such a proceeding, was not likely to listen to any proposal from him. It was with great difficulty and mortification that he was obliged to suppress a passion which had made far greater progress in his heart than the quarrel had done good to his affairs. This being the case, he was of opinion that his presence was necessary in Ireland, and that he was better out of the way of Miss Hamilton, if he was to remove those impressions which still troubled his repose."

Obviously there is a great confusion here. Talbot went to the Tower, the first time, six months before Gramont reached London. If he abandoned his hopes after his imprisonment and went to Ireland to forget Elizabeth Hamilton, then he was never a competitor with Gramont for her love. On the other hand, if he ever was a rival to him, it must have been between his own return to London in the summer of 1663 and the Chevalier's marriage to Elizabeth in December. It would not be surprising—in view of the letter to Ossory quoted in the last chapter—to find Talbot still

aspiring to the hand of Ormonde's niece, in spite of having so seriously offended Ormonde. It is perhaps the simplest solution of the difficulty to suppose that this was the case, and that Gramont or Anthony Hamilton, when the *Memoirs* were being written, erroneously introduced Talbot's imprisonment and departure to Ireland into the story.

Before leaving the subject of Gramont and the Hamiltons we may notice a tale about Frances Jennings's first husband, which may be true, because George is a favourite with his brother-in-law and receives kinder treatment from him than do most people. George Hamilton has been represented in recent literature as a great rake, but there does not appear anything to justify such a portrait. Certainly on the present occasion he was not particularly iniquitous. At the time when Richard Talbot returned from Ireland Elizabeth Hamilton was paying a visit of charity to a cousin, Elizabeth Whetenhall, living near East Peckham, in Kent. Thomas Whetenhall the husband, though a layman, was profoundly interested in theology and very little in his wife, who being young and very pretty, pined for a change of scene. She persuaded her cousin, at the end of her visit to East Peckham, to take her back to town with her, and on the road they were met by George Hamilton and Gramont, who had ridden to meet them. The former, being "both agreeable and handsome, made a great impression upon Mrs. Whetenhall, and

he was struck in his turn. Amid the amusements of London the acquaintance ripened, but at the last the lady began to show scruples. Hamilton immediately ceased his siege, and Mrs. Whetenhall, extremely mortified, returned to "her cabbages and turkeys at Peckham." Hamilton "suffered himself to be intoxicated with visions which unseasonably cooled the vigour of his pursuit and led him astray into another unprofitable undertaking"—which was nothing less than falling in love with Frances Stewart, who was causing such uneasiness to Lady Castlemaine just now. According to Gramont, Hamilton proceeded very far indeed in his suit to the little favourite, until at length he was obliged to warn him that such conduct could only ruin him. The young man took the advice very philosophically and ceased his dangerous attentions. It was another and a less easily captivated Frances that was destined to secure his affections finally.

CHAPTER II

MISTRESS JENNINGS AT COURT

WE have now reached again the time of Frances Jennings's arrival in London, though we cannot date this event precisely. The occasion of it was the determination of the Duchess of York to form a new court for herself. Gramont says that she "resolved to see all the young persons that offered themselves and, without any regard to recommendations, to choose none but the handsomest." This sounds as if the Duchess took her maids of honour, so to speak, without a character. Such was not the case, however. Circumstances combined to reduce her household, and in 1664 there appear to have been vacancies for three new maids. Mary Bagot, who was one of the greatest beauties of the day—and at the same time a virtuous woman—in that year married Charles Berkeley, recently created Viscount Fitzharding. Goditha Price had been dismissed in disgrace, and Miss Hobart, whose christian name we do not know and whose morals are painted

From an engraving by F. Bartolozzi, after the painting by Sir Peter Lely.

GODITHA PRICE.

a very peculiar colour by Gramont, had been removed by the Duchess to other duties in her household, to shelter her from certain scandals which were afloat. The only one of her former maids of honour still remaining was Mary Blague, who is found still with her in 1669, and must therefore have commended herself better to her mistress than she did to Gramont and to Elizabeth Hamilton, who played so cruel a joke upon her at the masquerade described in the seventh chapter of the *Memoirs*.

In place of those whom she had lost, the Duchess of York took Frances Jennings, Arabella Churchill and Anne Temple. Arabella Churchill, "a tall, pale-faced, skin-and-bone creature," as she is called by Gramont, was possibly the eldest of the three, being born in 1648. Of Miss Temple, who was about the same age as Frances Jennings, Gramont says: "She had a good shape, fine teeth, languishing eyes, a fresh complexion, an agreeable smile, and a lively air. Such was her outward form, but it would be hard to describe the rest; for she was simple and vain, credulous and suspicious, a coquette and a prude, very self-sufficient and very silly." She and Frances entirely eclipsed the other two maids, while Frances as completely eclipsed her in person and still more excelled her in mental accomplishments. In fact, except with regard to Elizabeth Hamilton, the *Memoirs* are nowhere so enthusiastic about any beauty of the Court as about Frances Jennings. That with regard to her

appearance Gramont's description was a true one may be gathered from its close agreement with that written by the French envoy Courtin in 1665.* The surviving portraits of Frances are somewhat disappointing when we compare them with these glowing accounts of her charms. Judged by them alone, she would not stand out among the fair ladies of her time. Clearly they fail to do her justice. Frances Jennings is not the only one of the Restoration beauties whom the Court painters somehow could not manage to catch on their canvases. On the other hand, some whom their contemporaries considered plain astonish us by their good looks. But Lely, of course, knew how to flatter as well as other and more recent fashionable portrait-painters.

Stripped of verbiage, Gramont's description represents Frances as having beautiful flaxen hair and a dazzlingly fair complexion, with an animated expression, which redeemed her from the insipidity often accompanying such fairness. Her nose and her hands were her weakest points. Nor was her mouth very small, but it was beautifully shaped. The comparison she suggests is "Aurora, or the goddess of spring."

"With this amiable person," continues Gramont, "she was full of wit and sprightliness, and all her movements were unaffected and easy. Her conversation was charming when she had a mind to please, subtle and delicate when she was disposed to raillery; but as she was subject to flights of the imagination

* Quoted below, p. 191.

and frequently began to speak before she had finished thinking, her utterances did not always convey what she wished."

As the little maid of honour was probably not more than fifteen, it is not surprising to hear the last statement. It is surprising, however, to find what was expected of girls of fifteen in those days; and still more surprising how often they answered expectations. It assuredly required a budding woman of the world to go through the temptations of Whitehall without serious scandal. And yet many girls did so (in spite of their "mad freaks," of which Lady Sandwich once talked to Pepys) and reached the haven of marriage without shipwreck on the way.

Doubtless, owing to the extremely gossip-loving character of so many of our informants, we get an over-coloured picture of the life of peril through which the maids of honour had to walk. But, even if we make a considerable allowance for credulity and malice in our authorities, we are still bound to admit the grave dangers attending on the office of the maids, and to admire the wisdom which many of them displayed. Frances Jennings was severely beset from the first and yet is never seen to falter. The *Memoirs of Gramont* are not wont to overload chastity with praise, but they are warm in their admiration of her conduct, which soon, they say, "left her companions no other admirers but such as remained constant from hopes of success."

Gramont's account of the Duke of York's persecution of Frances and the careless way in which she put aside his attentions and dropped his love-letters is too well known to need quotation. How much truth or fiction there is in it is impossible to say. We do not hear anything about it elsewhere. When the Duke had failed, Gramont makes the King attempt to fascinate her, thinking it unnatural that she should be beyond the power of temptation when, "in all probability, she had not imbibed such severe precepts from the prudence of her mother, who had never tasted anything more delicious than the plums and apricots of St. Albans." (This picture of Mrs. Jennings as the country housewife is scarcely what we should have expected to find in the *Memoirs of Gramont;* but evidently they knew nothing about "Mother Haggy.") Charles exerted himself to please; and he was no only a wit, but a king also, whereas James was neither. "The resolutions of the fair Jennings were commendable and very judicious; yet she was wonderfully pleased with wit, and royal majesty prostrate at the feet of a young lady is very persuasive. Mlle. Stewart however, would not consent to the King's project. She immediately took alarm, and desired His Majesty to leave to the Duke his brother the care of tutoring the Duchess's maids of honour and only attend to the management of his own flock"—unless he would consent to her getting married. "This menace being of a serious nature, the King obeyed; and Mlle. Jennings

had all the honour arising from this adventure, which both added to her reputation and increased the number of her admirers."

Among these admirers was soon reckoned Richard Talbot. Seeing that one was attached to the Duke, the other to the Duchess of York, we should have expected them to meet soon after Frances's arrival in London. But Gramont, when he brings them together, says: "I do not know how it was that he had not yet seen her, though he had heard her much praised." When they did meet Talbot found her so exceeding what he had been told that he fell in love with her at once and soon proceeded to a declaration.

Before making the acquaintance of Frances Jennings, however, Talbot had first come across another maid of honour—this one attached to the Queen—who was also destined to be his wife. Among the six maids appointed to the household of Catherine of Braganza after her arrival in England occurs the name of "M^rs^ Boynton." Katherine Boynton was the elder daughter of a Colonel Matthew Boynton, who had lost his life fighting on behalf of Charles in 1651, after a brave defence of Scarborough Castle, and her appointment in the Queen's household was no doubt a recognition of her father's merit, on account of which pensions had been assigned—but apparently not paid with more regularity than most other Restoration pensions—to her mother, herself, and her sister. Judged by her surviving portrait, which is at Malahide Castle,

Katherine was a beautiful woman. But Gramont, for some unknown reason, is very spiteful about her. In his first mention of her he classes her with "Mlle. Levingston and Mlle. Fielding" as little deserving of mention in the *Memoirs*.* Speaking later of Talbot's endeavour to banish thoughts of Elizabeth Hamilton from his mind, he says that he saw no one in the Queen's new Court whom he thought worthy of his attention. "Mlle. Boynton, however, thought him worthy of hers. Her person was slender and delicate, to which a good complexion and large motionless eyes gave at a distance an appearance of beauty, which vanished on closer inspection. She affected to lisp and to languish and to have two or three fainting fits a day. The first time that Talbot cast his eyes upon her she was seized with one of these fits. He was told that she had swooned on his account, believed it, and was eager to afford her assistance; and ever after that accident he showed her some kindness, more with the intention

* Gramont is quite inaccurate in his account of the Queen's maids of honour. He makes the original list consist of Frances Stewart, Mlles. Warmester, Bellenden, de la Garde and Bardou. The four last were replaced, he says, when the Queen altered her household, by Mlles. Wells, Levingston, Fielding and Boynton. Now we know, from a letter written by Lord Cornbury at Hampton Court on June 10th, 1662 (*H.M.C. Reports, XII., App., Pt.* 9, *Beaufort MSS.*, pp. 52-3), that Gramont's memory played him false. "We have yet a very unsettled household, nothing at all in order," says Cornbury (who was himself in attendance on the Queen). "Not one Lady of the Bedchamber named besides my Lady Suffolke. . . . The four dressers are fixed, who are my Lady Wood, Lady Scroope, M^rs Fraizer, and M^rs La Garde. The Maydes of Honour are likewise in waiting, viz., M^rs Cary, M^rs Stuart, M^rs Wells, M^rs Price, M^rs Boynton, M^rs Warmestry. The Maydes of the Privy Chamber are but two, my Lady Mary Savage, my Lady Betty Levingstone —my Lord Newbrugh's daughter."

of saving her life than to express any affection he felt for her."

The writer of the above description was evidently no admirer of the type of young lady which was later to become common both in life and in literature. Whether or not the picture was exaggerated there is no means of judging. The only allusion to Katherine Boynton in Pepys's *Diary* is at least consistent with what Gramont tells of her; for should we not expect a journey down the Thames to upset so delicate a creature? Pepys is describing the State visit to Woolwich, on October 26th, 1664, for the launching of the *Royal Catherine*. The King, Queen and Duke of York were all present, but we do not hear of the Duchess. The behaviour of the Court does not impress the diarist favourably. "Mrs Boynton and the Duchesse of Buckingham," he says, "had been very sicke coming by water in the barge (the water being very rough); but what silly sport they made with them in very common terms, methought, was very poor, and below what people think these great people say and do."

The fragile beauty, according to Gramont, was visibly affected by Talbot's apparent tenderness for her and sufficiently showed him her willingness to become his wife: an event which might have come about now, instead of five years later, had not Frances Jennings appeared on the scene and captivated Talbot's heart to such an extent that he felt compelled to declare his love to her.

His suit prospered at first. Gramont suggests a trait in Frances's character, of which we shall hear again, and which was prominent in her sister Sarah's. "Talbot," he says, "was possessed of a fine and brilliant exterior; his manners were noble and majestic; in addition to this he was particularly distinguished by the favour and friendship of the Duke; but his most essential merit in her eyes was his 40,000 *livres* a year in landed property, besides his employments. All these qualifications came within the requirements of the rules which she had resolved to follow with regard to lovers." She gave Talbot, therefore, a better reception than her earlier admirers, and, with the Duchess's approval, decided to marry him, though "her reason was more favourable to him than her heart."

The actual writer of this cynical remark, it must be remembered, was George Hamilton's brother; and we do not find evidence of any particular friendship between Anthony and Talbot, such as there was between yet another brother, Richard Hamilton, and Talbot later in life. In fact, to judge by the *Memoirs of Gramont* alone, we may imagine that Anthony cherished some grudge against his connection by marriage, to pay off which he gladly collaborated with Gramont after death had safely removed Talbot out of the way.

Nevertheless, her suitor's income, added to his good looks and his influence, may well have entered

into the reckoning of Frances Jennings. Her father's struggles cannot have failed to make her appreciate the value of money, and now she had tasted the luxuries of the life at Court.

Talbot was accepted. But he soon spoilt his chances. He did not discover any personal fault in the lady of his choice; but he did not like her acquaintance with Miss Price, whose dismissal had made one of the vacancies in the Duchess of York's household. Goditha Price suffers badly at the hands of Gramont. She was no beauty, being "short and thick," and, "as her person was not very likely to attract many admirers (which, however, she was resolved to have), she was far from being coy when an opportunity offered." One of her lovers was the Robert Dongan of whom we have already heard. Gramont, who calls him "Duncan," relates with gay malice the struggle for him between Miss Price and Miss Blague, and the victory of the former. But Dongan died, leaving Miss Price "plunged in a gulf of despair," and bequeathing to her a sealed box Not having the heart to open this herself, she took it to the Governess, or mother as she was also called, of the maids of honour. The Governess suggested that the Duchess of York should be asked to open the box, which she did, in the presence of a number of ladies. Inside she found all kinds of trinkets which Miss Price had sent to Dongan, and some packets of letters so "tender" that the Duchess, after the public discovery of the scandal, was obliged to dismiss her

maid. This is Gramont's account; but as Pepys, two years later, speaks of Miss Price as being "mistress publicly to the Duke of York," we may assume that the Duchess had another reason for wishing to get rid of her.

On her dismissal Goditha Price transferred her services to Lady Castlemaine—a proceeding which scarcely tends to vindicate her character. She was, however, a lively young person, full of wit and infectious spirits, and understood well how to make herself pleasant. It was not long before she met her successor in the Duchess of York's household and charmed her. Frances Jennings, though not herself gay, in the bad sense of the word, was amused to hear all the gay stories of the Court, and Goditha Price knew them and could tell them vivaciously.

Talbot, however, not unnaturally was afraid that this intimacy with Miss Price would damage Frances's reputation. "In the tone of a guardian rather than a lover," says Gramont, "he took upon himself to chide her for the disreputable company she kept. Mlle. Jennings was haughty beyond conception when once she took it into her head; and, as she liked Mlle. Price's conversation much better than his, she ventured to ask him to attend to his own affairs, and told him, if he only came over from Ireland to read her lectures, he might take the trouble to go back again as soon as he pleased." Talbot left her abruptly and sulked for a time. Then he altered his conduct and became

very humble, but without producing any effect upon her.

At this point the *Memoirs* make Harry Jermyn first reappear at Court after his departure in disgrace for having made love to Lady Castlemaine. He had left at the end of 1662, whether actually banished or, as Gramont states, forced by his uncle to anticipate the King's command by a previous retirement into the country. Gramont has not much that is good to say about either uncle or nephew. Henry Jermyn, senior, "a man of no great genius, had raised himself a considerable fortune from nothing, and by losing at play and keeping a great table made it appear still greater." Harry, though the youngest of all his nephews, was adopted by him and found his uncle's wealth of great service to him, even in his favourite pursuit of love-making. "For though [the younger] Jermyn was brave, and certainly a gentleman, yet he had neither brilliant actions nor distinguished rank to set him off; and as for his figure there was nothing advantageous in it. He was little; his head was large and his legs small; his features were not disagreeable,* but he was affected in his carriage and behaviour. All his wit consisted in expressions learned by rote, which he occasionally employed either in raillery or in love.

* Wissing's painting of him at Rushbrooke Hall, Bury St. Edmunds, bears this out. Later in life, when, as Lord Dover, he was about to be attainted for high treason—*i. e.*, for fidelity to James II., a witness before the House of Lords Committee describes him as "an indifferent, gross man, with black hair." (*H.M.C. Reports, XII., Pt.* 6, *House of Lords MSS.*, p. 231.)

This was the whole foundation of the merit of a man so formidable in amours."

No doubt professional jealousy coloured Gramont's description of Harry Jermyn; for the latter had certainly more conquests to boast of than the Chevalier. Lady Castlemaine, perhaps, was not much of a feather in his cap. But the Duchess of York was assigned to him by the scandalmongers as an admirer, and there can be no question that Mary, Princess of Orange, in her widowhood was considerably attracted by him. When James visited his sister at Breda in 1658, taking his friend with him, rumour coupled their names together so much that Charles heard of it and angrily summoned the young man back to Bruges. An acrimonious correspondence passed between the King and his sister, ending in a violent quarrel when they next met. Charles was not altogether unreasonable, for Mary confessed to her friend Lady Stanhope that "she was pleased with Harry Jermyn's love and had a kindness for him." In view of the gossip occasioned by Queen Henrietta Maria's dependence upon the elder Jermyn, it was certainly undesirable that there should be any occasion for talk about another royal widow and another Jermyn.

The *Memoirs of Gramont* make Harry Jermyn, spurred by the tales of Frances Jennings's pride and powers of resistance, come back to town just at the time when she had quarrelled with Talbot. She had also heard of him already, through her friend Miss

Price, and when she saw him, promptly fell in love with him. Jermyn, "not surprised at this victory, though not a little proud of it," felt his heart affected in turn. The Duchess of York, who had taken Frances under her protection ever since she had declined placing herself under that of the Duke, asked Jermyn his intentions and was satisfied with his assurances. The young man, moreover, let it be publicly known that he was willing—though he seemed in no hurry—to marry. So Frances received congratulations from everyone on her victory over "the terror of husbands and the plague of lovers."

Her triumph, however, was not destined to last long; and, indeed, neither side seems to have been very serious in the affair, if Gramont (the only writer to mention it) tells the story truly. They tired of each other about the same time. Jermyn, hearing of the naval raid planned under Prince Rupert against the Dutch—that "Guinea Expedition" which never sailed any farther on the way to Guinea than Portsmouth harbour—offered himself as a volunteer and went to Frances to tell her about it. But his manner of paying his addresses, "as though by habit," had already disillusioned her, and now his resolve to join the expedition without previously consulting her completed her disgust. When he acquainted her with his "heroical project," so far from giving him an opportunity for consoling her, she rallied him unmercifully. Nothing could be more glorious, she told him, for him

who had triumphed over the liberty of so many in Europe than to extend his conquests to other regions of the world, and she advised him to bring home all his female captives to replace the beauties who would die of grief for him in his absence. Gramont also makes her write a burlesque epistle to Jermyn from "a shepherdess in despair," in imitation of Ovid's epistle from Ariadne to Theseus, of which he says that an English verse translation had lately been published. But here Gramont anticipates by sixteen years the publication of the first English verse translation of the *Epistles*, so that the value of this testimony to the wit and education of Frances Jennings is at least doubtful.

Realising that Frances no longer cared for him, and confounded at his dismissal, Jermyn felt his love revived and even increased. But it was in vain. She continued to ridicule him, and ridicule is not a weapon which Don Juan cares to face. On October 5th, 1664, Prince Rupert sailed down the Thames in the *Henrietta* and proceeded to Portsmouth. Here the fleet stopped, not being sufficiently strong to put out to sea in face of the Dutch warships in the Channel. There was not even a brush with the enemy. The only danger run was from smallpox, which carried off one of Jermyn's personal companions at Portsmouth. Early in December the idea of the raid was definitely abandoned, and the Duke of York, who had taken over the command from Prince Rupert, returned to London.

The inglorious end of the "heroical project" probably inspired the sharp tongue of Frances Jennings to further gibes against the bold volunteer. Jermyn did not at once give up all hope. But, "notwithstanding all the efforts and attentions which he practised to regain her affections, she would never more hear of him."

Thus within the first year of her arrival at Court, not only had the country maiden of fifteen succeeded in putting aside the compromising attentions of the King and his brother, but she had also engaged herself in turn to two rising young men and sent them about their business. Such a record in itself is remarkable; in fact, may almost be called admirable when we consider what the careers of so many of her fellow maids of honour were like. And we shall see that she continued for more than another year in the atmosphere so fatal to the reputation of beauties without giving occasion to any worse reproach than that her high spirits made her easily led into adventure by a gay companion. Richard Talbot early discovered this weakness in her; but it did not prevent him from marrying her in the end and living with her happily, as far as we know, for the last ten years of his life. The period of her youth was pre-eminently an age of scandal, and many a good woman was foully slandered; yet to the last only one of the bitterest enemies of her second husband ventured to breathe a suspicion about her chastity.

CHAPTER III

TALBOT IN THE TOWER AGAIN

ALTHOUGH Jermyn had suffered the same fate as himself at the hands of the coquettish young maid of honour, Richard Talbot was not in a position to take immediate advantage of his rival's humiliation to renew his suit. For now he came into conflict again with the Duke of Ormonde over Irish affairs. In the spring of 1664 the Lord-Lieutenant had received a summons from the King to cross over to England, and he quitted Dublin at the end of May, leaving his son Ossory as Deputy. The matter requiring his presence in London was still the slowly dragging Settlement of Ireland. On his arrival he was set to work with a committee on the Bill of Explanation which he and the Irish Privy Council had drafted at the King's command the previous year. This laborious task occupied Ormonde and his colleagues until the May of 1665, so numerous were the petitions and provisos to be considered.

Talbot in the Tower again

The collision between Talbot and Ormonde was not long in taking place. The committee commenced its sittings in August. Now Talbot had been working hard since his arrival in England with the £18,000 in bonds, etc. Carte, while censuring him for his behaviour toward some of his clients, admits that he was not negligent "in cases of real difficulty, and where there was real guilt of the party as an obstacle to restitution." To prove that a former rebel ought to be included under the head of innocent Papists was obviously a hard matter, and of course among those who had applied to Talbot and the other "undertakers" were many such. It was to hide the fact of their guilt that they had been willing to promise so much money to their patrons. One of Talbot's clients was a certain James Allen, of St. Woolston's, *alias* Allen's Court. He had succeeded in getting on his behalf a decree from the Court of Claims, restoring him to his estate.* But he only managed this, his enemies said, by the corruption of witnesses before the Court.† Unfortunately for him, the case interested Hugh Montgomery, second Earl of Mount-Alexander

* Allen proceeded to sell it to Lord Berkeley and Richard Talbot (*Calendar of State Papers, Ireland*, 1663-5, under date April 13th, 1663). Talbot's anxiety about the matter is therefore easy to understand.

† It is but fair to Talbot to state that he alleged corruption on the other side. He writes to Bennet on February 4th, 1663, concerning Allen: "Though he was as innocent a person as could be, yet the horrid practices of my Lord of Mount-Alexander suborning witnesses against him will, I fear, prove him nocent." Mount-Alexander, he says, is "the greatest cowhyerd living." (*Calendar of State Papers, Ireland*, 1663-5.)

—who was in possession of Allen's property. Lord Mount-Alexander by some means got hold of some letters from Talbot to his brother Peter and to Sir Brian O'Neil, which revealed the fraud that had been practised. These he laid before Ossory and the Privy Council in Dublin, demanding a reversal of the decree of the Court of Claims.

About the same time that Ormonde's son in Ireland was asked to disturb Talbot's work on behalf of Allen, Ormonde himself in England made a suggestion to the Privy Council that a clause should be inserted in the Bill of Explanation to annul all decrees of restitution already obtained by bribes and perjury. Talbot, taking this suggestion to be aimed at him and his conduct in the Allen case particularly, was foolish enough to make public threats against the Lord-Lieutenant's life; taking care, says Carte, that the Duke should hear them. His brothers, too, "lay and ecclesiastical," echoed the threats. Ormonde disregarded them, believing—no doubt correctly—that they were only intended to frighten him into withdrawing his proposed clause. The publicity of the outrage, however, as in 1661, made it impossible for the King*

* Charles was first told of it, according to Clarendon, by Ormonde's brother-in-law, the Earl of Clancarty (the former Donogh MacCarty, Viscount Muskerry); and it was Sir Robert Talbot, anxious to keep his brother out of more serious trouble, who first went to Clancarty. With regard to the conduct of some other members of the family, there are two instructive letters to Ormonde in the summer of 1664 from one Patrick Moore, whose duty it was to keep the Lord-Lieutenant posted as to affairs in Dublin during his absence. Moore was friendly with John Talbot, who, though busying himself in finding

to treat the matter thus lightly. He accordingly applied to the Lord Chancellor for his advice as to what should be done. And here Clarendon's *Continuation* supplements Carte's account.

Clarendon relates that the King and the Duke of York came together to him, the former telling him, "with a very visible trouble in his countenance," how Dick Talbot had a resolution to assassinate the Duke of Ormonde, and had sworn in the presence of two or three persons that he would do it to avenge some injuries which he pretended the Duke had done his family. He had said that he would rather fight Ormonde, who he knew would be willing enough; but that he should never be able to bring to pass, and so he would take his revenge in any way that offered. "And every body knew that the man had courage and wickedness enough," says Clarendon.

The Chancellor considered Richard Talbot's conduct scandalous enough to deserve exemplary punishment, but he advised moderation. He did not believe Ormonde in any present danger of his life, but he was afraid that what would happen would be that Talbot, after first denying his threats, would repent and,

clients for his brothers among the dispossessed Irish, was apparently willing to make certain disclosures concerning them. On August 13th Moore says: "I have perused some letters written to John Talbot by his brother Peter from Court"—Peter had ventured back into England, but was in a cautious mood—"wherein he writes that Thomas Talbot so exclaims against Your Grace that they are all like to be lost, and that he wonders he is not banished." In the other letter Moore relates, on John Talbot's authority, that Lord Orrery had advised "Dick" at least to show Ormonde a "good outside."

giving any satisfaction that might be asked of him, obtain the forgiveness of the King and the Duke of York; for he represents James as being equally angry with Charles. He, therefore, was in favour of hushing the matter up rather than calling attention to it only to inflict some light and ordinary punishment.

The King, however, protested that there need be no fear of inadequate punishment. The offence was unpardonable, and both he and the Duke had determined to take the opportunity of freeing themselves from the whole family's importunity. "All the brothers were naughty fellows," said Charles, "and had no good meaning." He went on to speak severely of Father Peter and Father Tom, while the Duke spoke against Dick. Both asserted that they would be in great ease by the absence of them all.

If Clarendon's recollection of this interview be accurate, it is tantalizing that he does not tell us why the Duke was so provoked with his Gentleman of the Bedchamber at this moment that he was thoroughly in accord with the King as to the necessity for stern action. He merely says that he "knew there was something else, which was not so fit to be mentioned, that had offended them both as much." The Duke of York had only recently returned to town from the fleet. We do not hear that Talbot had gone with him when he went down to Portsmouth in November to supersede Prince Rupert. But, even if he did not go, this does not necessarily show that he was then

n the Duke's displeasure, as he might well have obtained leave to remain in London to look after his clients' interests. Still Clarendon, prejudiced though he was, would not have invented the circumstance of the Duke's anger against his favourite, so we must allow that Talbot had managed to give offence to James, without attempting to guess how.

Seeing that the royal brothers were resolute in their intention, Clarendon advised that Dick should be sent to the Tower, and that the Privy Council should be told the story the next day, when it would no doubt order a prosecution. "Thereby the gentleman would be put in such a condition that he should not trouble the Court with his attendance; and other men should by his example find that their tongues are not their own, to be employed according to their own malicious pleasures."

The same night, says Clarendon, Talbot was sent to the Tower, both King and Duke declaring themselves determined on the full rigour of the law. The warrant still survives, dated December 22nd, 1664, to the Lieutenant of the Tower for the imprisonment of "Richard Talbot, esq., committed for high misdemeanours."*

* Gramont's story of Talbot and his gambling debt, if there be any basis of fact in it, must belong to this period; for Gramont was not in England in 1661. He says: "Talbot played deep and was tolerably forgetful. The Chevalier de Gramont won three or four thousand guineas of him the very evening on which he was committed to the Tower. That accident had made him forget his usual punctuality in paying the next morning whatever he had lost overnight; and this debt so far escaped his memory that it never once occurred

Ormonde's rash opponent was likely to spend much longer in the Tower on his account this time than he had spent three years before. And not only he, but also two more of his family were involved in the punishment; for Carte says that Sir Robert and "the other brother" (Thomas, it appears) were simultaneously sent to the Fleet prison. This is the only instance of which we hear of Sir Robert Talbot falling into disgrace in the company of his juniors. Possibly he had allowed himself to be carried away by momentary irritation to the extent of speaking indiscreetly against Ormonde; though we must remember that Clarendon makes him already alienated from Ormonde because he had not asked sufficient on his behalf from the King. It is clear, however, that Ormonde had not lost his kindness for Sir Robert, for he now appealed to the King and persuaded him to release him before the Christmas holidays were over.

Dick's Christmas was perforce spent in jail. But his friends were not idle on his behalf. Clarendon says that from the first day of his imprisonment those most closely attached to the King and the Duke of York, in violation of the rule against such civilities being paid to persons under His Majesty's displeasure

to him after he was released." So the Chevalier took an occasion to remind him politely. Talbot was going on a journey to Ireland, when Gramont came to bid him farewell, and besought him not to fall sick on the road—or, if he did, to remember him in his will. Talbot at once recollected the debt and, embracing him, promised to send the money instantly. "The Chevalier possessed a thousand of these genteel ways of refreshing the memories of those who were apt to be forgetful in their payments."

presumed to visit the prisoner and to censure those who had advised his commitment. And after a few days, when it was thought that the Duke's passion had in some degree abated, Lord Berkeley summoned courage to tell him that his reputation was suffering for allowing a servant so near to him to be imprisoned for a few hasty words, to which he had been provoked. Berkeley said also that it was well known to be the doing of the Chancellor, an enemy of all the Talbots and no great friend of any of the Duke's servants, who might expect in a short time to be few in number if he had power to remove them. The bystanders supported Berkeley; and though the Duke did not at once yield, his resolution was weakened. The same method was then tried with the King. Finally the brothers grew weary of their severity, and appealed to Ormonde to forgive his enemy. They had no difficult task here. Although he had previously made no effort on behalf of any but Sir Robert, now Ormonde "disdained to make himself a prosecutor in such a transgression. And so the prisoner returned to Whitehall, with the advantage which men who have been unjustly imprisoned usually receive: and all men thought he triumphed over the Chancellor."

The approximate date of Talbot's release is fixed by a letter written on January 28th, 1665, from Sir John Perceval in Dublin to Robert Southwell. "We hear," says Perceval, "that R. Talbott is out of the Tower, the two friars being taken and owning the words and

acquitting him." The Dublin version of the affair, it seems, was not quite the same as Clarendon's; and we cannot tell who were the *two* friars who owned the words, though one may be Father Thomas.

Richard Talbot came out of the Tower, after about a month's detention, with no sense of defeat. He found himself strong enough, moreover, to get the decree in favour of Allen confirmed, the claim of Lord Mount-Alexander being settled by compensation being awarded him in a clause of the Bill of Explanation.

Nor did the affair damage the rest of the family; at any rate, not Sir Robert. When Ormonde, before the end of the sittings of the committee on the Bill of Explanation, presented to the King in council some lists of persons who had been recommended to him as worthy of His Majesty's grace and favour, among the five men to whose recommendations Ormonde had listened one was Sir Robert.

The exertions of the youngest of the Talbot brothers on behalf of the Irish concerned in the Settlement were not yet over, as we shall see. But for the present there was nothing more for him to do. The committee having finished its discussions on May 26th, and the King having inserted in the Bill twenty "nominees" from the lists submitted to him, Ormonde left England and on September 3rd landed again in Ireland. The Irish Parliament passed the Bill of Explanation as presented to it, and on December 23rd, 1665, the royal assent was given and it became law.

All that remained was its execution, for which a commission was appointed, one of whom was Sir Winston Churchill again.

So the Settlement was at last legally effected—a weary compromise which pleased no section, least of all that which it most favoured. The Protestants of the Soldiers' and Adventurers' party, who were called upon to give up comparatively little of what they claimed, were very dissatisfied; and at the beginning of 1666 there was a "fanatic" plot in Munster, soon followed by a mutiny of troops in Ulster. The Roman Catholics, who were heavy losers by the Settlement, worked to upset it by other ways than by futile rebellion. And the youngest of the Talbots, hot-headed though he had shown himself on various occasions, was able to adapt himself to the needs of the time. "Fighting Dick Talbot" had as keen a liking for the methods of diplomacy as either of his professionally peaceful brothers.

CHAPTER IV

THE DIVERSIONS OF A MAID OF HONOUR

FRANCES JENNINGS had clung so firmly to her friendship with Miss Price that she had for its sake broken off her engagement with Talbot. It was not long before she paid the penalty for her attachment to so volatile and reckless a person; though it is improbable that, at her age, she therefore thought any less of her dangerous friend or put an immediate end to the intimacy between them.

The scrape into which Frances was led by Goditha Price is a very well-known story, thanks to the *Memoirs of Gramont*. But it is necessary to mention it here, if at less length than Gramont devotes to it, because it has been made the foundation of an attack on the moral character of the younger girl. The occasion of the adventure was one of the freaks of that extraordinary character John Wilmot, second Earl of Rochester. During his short life of thirty-three years Rochester made himself famous for his wit, his literary achievements (however little they may appeal to modern

From an engraving, after a painting by Sir Peter Lely.

FRANCES JENNINGS, DUCHESS OF TYRCONNEL.

taste), his masquerading, and his debauchery. In 1665 he was only eighteen years of age, but he had already taken his degree at Oxford and spent a year or two in travels through France and Italy. When he came to Court he had the recommendations of his late father's services to Charles I. and his own brilliant qualities. His ready tongue appealed to Charles II. and his courtiers, and in return for the amusement which he gave them they initiated him into the life of pleasure which occupied so much of their days. But his satire was too undisciplined and frequently got him into disgrace. At the beginning of 1665 he was in retirement at his country seat at Adderbury, Oxfordshire, having been banished for the third time, according to Gramont. Bishop Burnet (who had an odd friendship with him, imagined that he prepared his soul for death, and wrote a biography of him) merely says that Rochester was "under an unlucky accident, which obliged him to keep out of the way." He wearied of his exile before he was recalled by the King and came up to town to live incognito, making himself agreeable to the merchants and their wives and railing before them against the ways of the Court—a favourite topic with the City people, as we may see from Pepys's *Diary*. But this disguise did not satisfy Rochester for long; so he suddenly changed his personality again, took rooms at a goldsmith's house in Tower Street, and gave himself out as Alexander Bendo, an Italian wonderworker, with

infallible remedies (for women in particular) and a knowledge of palmistry and the stars. His fame quickly spread from the City to Whitehall, first to the servants and then through them to their mistresses. Miss Price's woman came to her with a tale of the facts which he had read from her hand. Goditha passed the news on to Frances, who was at once fired with a desire to go to the magician's. "The enterprise was certainly very rash," says Gramont, "but nothing was too rash for Miss Jennings, who was of the opinion that a woman might despise appearances, provided she was in reality virtuous."

It was necessary, of course, for them to disguise themselves for their excursion into the City, and Frances needed a good disguise to hide her brilliant fairness. They decided to go as orange-girls. Orange-selling in those days (though probably lucrative, with oranges at sixpence apiece) was scarcely a reputable pursuit, owing to the freedom with which the gentlemen were wont to treat the sellers. Dressed in their novel attire and with a basket each, the two slipped through St. James's Park and took a hackney-coach at Whitehall Gate. The Duchess of York was going to the theatre that evening, and had excused Frances from attendance at her request. As the coach passed the playhouse, Miss Price was seized with a fresh idea, and suggested that they should go in and sell their oranges under the very eyes of the Duchess and the rest of the Court. Frances accepted the challenge at once.

The *Memoirs of Gramont* have now a graphic account —vivid enough to have been written from notes made at the time or to have been invented by a clever romancer—of how the girls reached the theatre door and offered their wares; first to the handsome Henry Sidney, soon to be Master of the Horse to the Duchess of York, who was too busy adjusting his own curls to attend to anything else; and then to Harry Killigrew. This latter young man, whom some of his contemporaries liked so much, but whom the references in Pepys alone suffice to prove a complete blackguard, replied, as might have been expected, with offensive suggestions to Frances. Upset and agitated, she had no longer any wish but to get home. Miss Price took her away hurriedly from the theatre, but, being still eager to continue the adventure, persuaded her not to go back yet. So they took their coach again and drove on to the City. They had almost reached the astrologer's in Tower Street, and had already ordered the coachman to pull up, when by ill chance there appeared on the scene Henry Brounker, just starting on his way back from dinner with a city friend. This man, a remote connection by marriage of the Jennings family, is described by Clarendon as "never notorious for anything but the highest degree of impudence and stooping to the most infamous offices." Clarendon is supported by Pepys (who at this very time was terribly afraid that Brounker would get the post of treasurer at the Navy Office, which he

wanted, and obtained, himself) and Gramont. The last-named, after speaking of Brounker's disagreeable character and his passion for women—his harem at Sheen Abbey, the former Carthusian Abbey at Richmond, was a byword—concludes with the strange remark: "In other respects he was a very honest man and the best chess-player in England."

Whatever Brounker's strength at chess, it was certainly safer for an opponent to meet him across the board than for unprotected women to meet him in the street at night. When the two companions saw him they tried to escape his eye and drove on a little way. But he followed them, and when they alighted came up to them. Gramont says that he noticed that their shoes and stockings were better than women of their assumed station usually wore. He had first taken them for a girl and her "mother-abbess." But their endeavours to avoid him and their disregard of his advances caused him to look so hard that he recognised them. He did not betray this fact at once, but tormented them awhile, releasing them at last with an enigmatic remark, from which they could not tell whether he knew them or not.

The oranges then brought down on them the final disaster. They had handed their baskets to the coachman when they got out. Having shaken off Brounker and abandoned all thought of visiting the astrologer, they returned to the coach, to find the man in the midst of a mob of young ruffians, who were trying

to steal the fruit. With difficulty they persuaded him to abandon these and to drive them home, assailed with low abuse as they fled. They then got back to Whitehall, vowing never to attempt a like adventure again.

In comparison with Gramont's elaborate tale, Pepys's account in his entry for February 21st, 1665, is very brief. Lady Sandwich, his cousin's wife, talks to him that day of "what mad freaks the Mayds of Honour at Court have," and tells how "Mrs Jenings, one of the Duchesse's mayds, the other day dressed herself like an orange wench, and went up and down and cried oranges; till falling down, or by such accident, though in the evening, her fine shoes were discovered, and she put to a good deal of shame."

It is upon this orange-girl story—and this story alone—that Lord Macaulay builds his statement that Frances Jennings was "distinguished by beauty and levity even among the crowd of beautiful faces and light characters who adorned and disgraced Whitehall during the wild carnival of the Restoration." A more preposterous deduction from the silly escapade of a girl of fifteen, led away by an older companion, could scarcely have been imagined. Macaulay continues: "Sober people predicted that a girl of so little discretion and delicacy would not easily find a husband." This is an obvious reference to Lady Sandwich, whom Pepys records to have observed that few men would venture on these maids of honour for wives. Now

Lady Sandwich was doubtless an estimable lady; but she was forty years of age and scarcely likely therefore to look with sympathy on the frivolity of fifteen. Yet she only describes the affair as "a mad freak"—which is a very suitable description of it.

If anything be required to disprove the imputation that Frances Jennings was pre-eminent among "the light characters who adorned and disgraced Whitehall during the wild carnival of the Restoration," it may be found in the next episode in her career, in which she figures, on unimpeachable authority, as an innocent child, indulged and petted by the Court in general.

In the April of 1665 Hugues de Lionne, Foreign Secretary to Louis XIV., sent over on a visit to England his first-born, Louis, Marquis de Berny, aged about nineteen, who, he thought, would be the better for such polish as he might acquire at Whitehall, then recognised as the centre of the polite world. The young man was far from brilliant, and his father put him in the charge of Courtin, one of the *célèbre Ambassade* which strove in vain from April to November to prevent the unofficial Anglo-Dutch hostilities extending so far as to involve the intervention of France, at this time bound by treaty to help the Dutch in case of war. Courtin and Cominges, the regular French Ambassador in London, bestowed on the youth a paternal care, as is proved by the most entertaining letters preserved in the French Foreign Office amid much that is of the greatest political importance.

Louis de Berny received a warm welcome at Whitehall on account of his father's eminent position in France, and was duly pleased with it. He also lost no time before starting his education as a man of the world. The first letter which interests us is one dated May 24th (new style), 1665, in which Courtin tells the father of his son's good beginning:

"He is rather bashful, but we have put courage into him and . . . he has at last made his declaration, which was well received by one of the prettiest girls in England, Mademoiselle Genins, who is of the household of the Duchess of York. She is small, but has a fine figure, a splendid complexion, hair like Madame de Longueville's (you will remember), quick brilliant eyes, and the finest and whitest skin I have ever seen. The Duchess, who is somewhat severe towards others, finds the pair so well matched that she is the first to favour them. The Queen-Mother, King and Court are of the same opinion. People laugh, but I assure you that the affair progresses well, and that you need feel no anxiety, for you may be certain I will give due warning if our cavalier goes too far. His gallantry has just reached the right point to make him a man of the world. I will let you know how things go."

Gifts of strawberries were sent every evening by the young Frenchman to his lady-love, and he himself

was sick once from an over-indulgence in cream—which at least suggests that he shared the repasts. But the envoy, while he smiled benignantly on such conduct, recognised that de Berny had come to Whitehall for polish, not for an entanglement. Only four days after he had written the above-quoted letter, Courtin remembers his promise to give due warning if the cavalier goes too far.

On May 16th/26th the Duchess of York went down to Harwich to meet the Duke, who was expected there with the fleet after a coasting raid along the Dutch coast. Anne took her Court with her, and de Berny was anxious to accompany her in order to see as much as possible of Frances Jennings. He was not allowed to have his way, however. "I opposed your son's plan of visiting the fleet with the Duchess of York," wrote Courtin to Lionne on May 28th (new style). "He is of so ardent a temperament that I did not think it right to trust him for five or six days, from morning to night, in the company of a young lady, with whom he might perhaps get on more intimate terms than I could wish." Instead of flirting with Frances, de Berny was set to write to the French Ambassador at the Hague, on lines laid down by Courtin, informing him of the progress of political affairs in England. The assistance of Cominges was also called for to keep the youth employed and out of mischief.

To judge from what he wrote, Cominges looked on

the love affair with a more indulgent eye than Courtin. He confessed in a June despatch to Lionne that he had not the heart to cut it short when it might make a man of the boy, "especially as he could not make a better choice than his little mistress." Already, he said, he noticed more ease in de Berny's conversation, a greater care of his person, and less shyness in society.

But sufficient discipline was exercised over de Berny to make him at least restive, and he showed this in a peculiar way. "Your son is faithless," wrote Courtin on June 8th, "and the King has discovered it. The truth is, as I have told you, that he felt his honour touched, and did not wish us to be suspicious of his exceeding due bounds. So there is nothing to fear on this score." The one pity was that, on his own confession, de Berny could only love young ladies, whereas, according to Courtin, persons of his age should be taken in hand by the mature to cure them of their bashfulness and slowness to act.

How the faithlessness of Lionne's son was shown we are told in another of Courtin's letters. "Your son," he says, "will inform you what Mistris Bointon is like.* He pretended to be in love with her to spite Mistris Genins. It is true Mistris Genins was quite in the wrong. She would not let him kiss her hands, but in the end she saw that it was better to yield her hands than to lose her gallant, and so the quarrel was made up."

* Courtin himself calls her very pretty.

It is certainly curious that, in order to pique the maiden who afterwards became Richard Talbot's second wife, Louis de Berny should have elected to flirt with her who was to be his first. We may at least take this as a tribute to the good looks of both ladies.

This innocent love-making, however, was brought to an end very soon. The plague intervened, and although the French ambassadors stayed on to accompany the Court in its flight, first to Hampton Court, then to Salisbury, and finally to Oxford, it was thought advisable to send Lionne's son home to France, advantage being taken of the fact that the Queen-Dowager Henrietta Maria was leaving for France at the same time. Before the Court left Whitehall at the end of June, according to the English calendar, de Berny had made his farewells. On July 12th (new style) Courtin writes to Lionne, from the temporary lodgings of the French envoys at Kingston, that on the previous Thursday evening the King of England had greatly teased "Mistris Genins" about her admirer, causing her to blush and to appear more beautiful than ever. As for de Berny, the King related to Courtin that he had asked one of the courtiers who saw him off at Calais to let him know how Frances looked on the day he left. Charles declared he himself had never seen such a picture of desolation and woe as the young gallant made on the Queen-Mother's yacht.

Lionne had already received a letter written jointly by three of the Embassy, telling him of his son's great

success at the English Court, where he would be much missed, and assuring him that de Berny was "esteemed by the King and the two Queens, and dearly loved by the prettiest girl in England." Courtin was also sure of the little lady's love—or, at least, said he was. Nevertheless, we need not suppose that her heart was deeply touched, though she may easily have been flattered at the addresses of the celebrated Lionne's son.

Frances had played her part in the education of the Marquis, to the satisfaction of his various guardians. Cominges wrote to Paris that he hoped the trip would not have hurt de Berny, and that his exacting father would find a pleasing change in his attitude towards life. But whatever Lionne thought of him on his return home, the young man completely failed to make his mark in the world. He married a cousin, and after a fall which injured his head became incapable of managing his own affairs. As far as Frances Jennings was concerned, however, he passed entirely out of her life at the end of June, 1665.

After the departure of Louis de Berny, a former suitor reappeared to plead his love again to the maid of honour. After his second imprisonment in the Tower Richard Talbot is lost to view for a while, in spite of the bold manner in which we are assured that he carried off the affair when he had obtained his release. We do not know whether he was present at the great naval victory of the Duke of York over the

Dutch on June 3rd. George Hamilton we hear of as one of the volunteers who joined the fleet just before the battle. Talbot may have been present in attendance on the Duke on board the *Royal Charles* and seen the tragic death, at their master's very side, of Falmouth and Muskerry. He may, too, have been one of those who, on June 16th, returned with the Duke, as Pepys says, "all fat and lusty, and ruddy by being in the sun." But we cannot say for certain that he was with James until after the flight from London to escape the plague.

It is on the northern progress of the Duke and Duchess that we meet with Talbot again. While the King and Queen went westward to Salisbury, James and his wife visited York. They came down on August 5th, according to the *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby;* * on September 23rd the Duke left for Oxford, followed soon by the Duchess. No attention need be paid to Gramont's ridiculous story of the Duchess having

* A very entertaining letter from Sir William Coventry to Lord Arlington, written from Leicester on August 1st, describes the first part of this journey. At Northampton the Duke of York declined an invitation to breakfast at Lord Banbury's; but his lordship stopped the coach as it passed and, being again refused, "laid hold of His Highness's leg and pulled so hard that he had almost drawn off his shoe." This rhetoric, with the trouble he expressed, induced their Royal Highnesses to go in, where a table was prepared with sweetmeats and fruit. He was importunate with the Duchess to see his lady, who was lying in, but as she was not ready to be seen the Duchess broke loose, with a promise to see her on her return. Coventry adds that "Lady Yerbury's sisters [Mary and Margaret Blague], M^rs Jennings and M^rs Temple have impaired their beauty by heat and swelling in the face," and considers this "a providence to preserve those who approach them frequently from danger." (*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1664-5.)

urged her husband to go to York, in order the better to hide an intrigue with Henry Sidney. But it may be noted that Gramont says that if the move to York was agreeable to her ("to avoid exposing the inclinations of her heart to the scrutiny of so many inquisitors"), it was also far from displeasing to any of her household except Miss Jennings. And Miss Jennings was displeased, he says, because Jermyn was not one of the party. (Gramont has forgotten that he made Frances have nothing more to say to Jermyn after the time of the Guinea Expedition; or, rather, he has so forgotten the course of events that he places the Guinea Expedition of 1664 after the ride to York, which was really a year later.) Jermyn's absence was caused by an illness which he had contracted through an attempt to ride a horse twenty miles in one hour for a wager of five hundred pounds. Frances had therefore to go to York without seeing Jermyn, but "had the gratification of venting her ill-humour throughout the journey by appearing displeased with everything which seemed to please the rest of the company."

In view of Gramont's confusion of dates with regard to Talbot's courtship of Frances Jennings, it is impossible to tell how much belief should be given to the details of his account of the ride to York, and what happened after it. The account, however, is amusing enough to reproduce in part, and we may presume it to have some foundation in fact. On the journey,

Talbot, says Gramont, flattering himself that his rival's absence might produce some change in his favour, was attentive to every movement of Frances; while it was contrary to her disposition to remain long in a serious humour, and her natural vivacity led her into witty sallies which encouraged him to hope that she would soon forget Jermyn and remember that he himself was the first whose passion she had encouraged. He kept his distance, however, being of opinion that it ill became an injured lover to betray the least weakness.

But "Mlle. Jennings was so far from thinking of his resentment that she did not even recollect he had ever paid his addresses to her; and her thoughts being wholly taken up with the poor sick man, she conducted herself towards Talbot as if they had never had anything to say to each other. It was to him that she usually gave her hand in getting into or out of the coach. She conversed more readily with him than with any other person, and without intending it did everything to make the company believe her cured of her passion for Jermyn in favour of her former lover. Talbot seemed convinced of this like the rest, and, thinking it proper now to act another part in order to let her know that his sentiments towards her were still the same, he resolved to address her in the most tender and affectionate manner upon the subject. Fortune seemed to favour him and smoothe the way for his intended discourse. He was alone with her in

her chamber;* and, what was better still, she was rallying him about Mlle. Boynton, saying that 'they were undoubtedly much obliged to him for his attendance upon them on their journey, while poor Mlle. Boynton had fainting fits at least twice a day for love of him.'" Talbot was just on the point of protesting his continued love for his hostess, when Anne Temple came in with a satirical verse epistle by Lord Rochester, in which he touched on the subject of Miss Jennings, and said that "Talbot had struck terror among the people of God by his gigantic stature, but Jermyn, like a little David, had vanquished the great Goliath." Frances at first laughed heartily at this, but afterwards sighed tenderly, "Poor little David!" and turned her head aside to shed a few tears. Talbot, stung to the quick, went abruptly out of the room, "vowing never to think any more of a giddy girl, whose conduct was regulated neither by sense nor by reason; but," concludes Gramont, "he did not keep his resolution."

This is the last incident of which we hear concerning Frances Jennings and Richard Talbot together until they meet again, widow and widower, in Paris, thirteen years later. Talbot went to Dublin; and soon after Frances accompanied her mistress to Oxford for the long visit of the Court there to avoid the plague.

* This was no sign of levity of character on the part of Frances, for it was not considered improper for ladies at Court to receive male visitors in their bedrooms.

CHAPTER V

TWO MARRIAGES

WE have heard little of George Hamilton since he took his friend Gramont's advice to abandon his dangerous flirtation with Frances Stewart. In spite of the large part which he plays in the memoirs of his brother-in-law, his name does not figure very frequently in other contemporary writers during the period between the Restoration and his marriage. Pepys, for instance, only mentions him casually on January 20th, 1664, with his elder brother under the name of "the Hambletons," who, like Fitzharding and Sandwich, are reputed lovers of Lady Castlemaine. But George advanced steadily in favour. The King made him a grant at the beginning of 1664, of the curious post of joint licenser of peddlars in Ireland, and on April 30th, of the same year, ordered that Sir Charles Sedley's fine of a thousand marks, inflicted on him by the Court of King's Bench for "mis-

Photo by Emery Walker, after the picture by an unknown artist in the National Portrait Gallery.

SIR GEORGE (COUNT) HAMILTON.

demeanours,"* should be given to him. He further obtained a commission as lieutenant in his regiment. As a suitor, therefore, he was able to boast of noble descent, a handsome person, and good prospects of a successful career. What was lacking to him was money, of which he had none apart from what he received from the royal bounty; and consequently it might have been expected that he would have sought for a rich match. On the contrary, he chose a wife poorer than himself, and must have married purely for love.

Nothing is known about George Hamilton's courtship of Frances Jennings. Both bridegroom and bride were favourites of the Royal Family, and the King in particular hastened to show his approval of the marriage by bestowing on Hamilton a pension of £500 a year. The date of this grant was April 20th, 1666, so that the wedding evidently took place in the spring of that year. As we shall see, although Charles's intentions were good and he desired to supply the young couple with what they both lacked, payment of the pension soon ceased; the King's Privy Purse, though drawing the unprecedented amount of six or eight hundred thousand pounds from the country's revenues, being unable to cope with His Majesty's prodigal distribution of gifts to Lady Castlemaine and his male parasites.

Frances's first marriage, however, certainly began

* *i.e.*, his disgusting drunken orgy in the company of Lord Buckhurst and Sir Thomas Ogle, to which Pepys alludes on July 1st, 1663.

with favourable auspices, and before a year had passed a child was born.* On March 21st, 1667, a daughter was baptized at St. Margaret's, Westminster, under the name of Elizabeth, in honour, no doubt, of her aunt. It is noticeable, in view of what was soon to befall her father, that this child was baptized according to the Anglican rites.

The popular agitation against the Roman Catholics had slumbered for some years since Charles had been compelled, in 1661, to break the promises of religious toleration which he had made in his declaration at Breda. The administration of the penal laws had not been severe, as may be seen from the history of the Talbots and Hamiltons up to now. The Roman Catholics actually received a great deal of liberty, in ecclesiastical, civil and military affairs, which was theoretically denied to them. But the Great Fire gave an opportunity to the intolerant to attack the Papists. They could not, indeed, prove the preposterous accusation that these were the authors of the Fire. They succeeded, however, by the dissemination of the stories got together to support it, in setting in motion a wave of public feeling which carried them on to the victory which they sought; and in Parliament they forced the King, at their mercy for want of money,

* Perhaps it was in anticipation of this event that Charles in February granted to Hamilton, jointly with the Marquis de Blanquefort, the sole licensing for seven years of all sorts of lotteries in England, Ireland, and the Plantations. (*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, February 25th, 1667.) We shall see Blanquefort (Louis de Duras) associated with Hamilton again later.

.o command the execution of the laws against Roman Catholics. Priests must leave the country, all suspects must take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, all known Papists must be disarmed, and all such as were in the Army, whether as officers or as private soldiers, must be dismissed.

None suffered more heavily from this persecution than the Hamilton brothers—such of them, at least, with the exception of James, as had already commenced their military careers. George, in particular, having the best prospects, was threatened with the loss of everything. Fortunately, his connection with France during his boyhood, when he had doubtless met the young Louis, now stood him in good stead. A private overture was made to him that if he could bring over with him to Paris the men dismissed from the English service he would be very welcome. Anglo-French hostilities, languid from the start, had ceased altogether at the end of 1666, and were succeeded by a secret treaty. So, with the consent of Charles, Hamilton accepted the offer, and the other Roman Catholics in the Lifeguards agreed to go with him. The officers were not deprived of their pay, but were allowed to compound for it with those willing to give them a lump sum. Hamilton thus made a bargain with the young Duke of Monmouth for £1,500, and we hear of £600 passing to him in 1670 from the Paymaster of the Forces, which was evidently an instalment of this £1,500.

Commenting on the arrangement for the transfer of Hamilton's services to France, Henry Savile says, in a letter to his brother on September 17th, 1667: "To show how men suffer for conscience sake, George Hamilton goes into France with 200 of the guards that were Catholiques, who are to be call'd there *Les Gens d'Armes de Madame*, and the employment will be worth [to] him above 3,000*l.* a year."

Savile's allusion to the suffering "for conscience sake" sounds sarcastic in conjunction with the mention of the expected salary attached to the post. Hamilton undoubtedly hoped to find in his new position something to compensate him for his exile from England. In a newsletter dated October 1st, 1667, we read: "Mr. George Hamilton is assured of the very honourable conditions he and his men are to have in France. Sir Henry Jones goes as his Lieutenant, Lord Morpeth as his Cornet, and Mr. Skelton as his Quartermaster."

Among those who accompanied George Hamilton was probably his brother Anthony. Richard and John, also, either left England now or, if they were as yet too young, followed very shortly into the service of France. The best military training in the world was at this time to be obtained in the French army, and George at least took advantage of it in a way which promised him a fine career, had not an accident unfortunately cut him off. Anthony and Richard do not appear to have developed much military talent, though we shall see Richard not altogether

unsuccessful in a high command in Ireland in 1689; but John won great praise before he received his fatal wound at Aughrim in 1691.

George Hamilton received, in addition to his appointment in France, another consolation for his enforced retirement from the English army on account of his religion. Before the close of 1667 the King knighted him; and it was with his new title and the hopes of £500 a year from England that he left the country in the following February to make a home for his wife and infant daughter in Paris.

If Richard Talbot was at this period as sincerely attached to Frances Jennings as the *Memoirs of Gramont* represent him to be, he must have sustained a severe blow when she married Hamilton in the spring of 1666. He did not immediately seek solace in the quarter where Gramont says it had long been awaiting him. It was not until three years later, indeed, that he turned to Katherine Boynton. The dates of marriages of Roman Catholics at this time are seldom to be ascertained. The nearest approach which we can make to that of the union between Talbot and his first wife is through an order from King Charles to Sir George Carteret, Vice-Treasurer of Ireland, on April 3rd, 1669, to pay £4,000 to Colonel Richard Talbot, without account, out of the first money coming into his hands of any arrears of revenue in Ireland; and a warrant of the following May 20th to the Commissioners of Accounts at Dublin, which

says, "On a marriage lately had between Colonel Richard Talbot and Cathrine Boynton . . . We by letters of April 3rd, 1669, warranted," etc. Half the £4,000 was paid at once, the other half was to be paid in 1670; though, as a matter of fact, it was not paid until the following year.

It seems, therefore, that the wedding must have taken place at some date in May. The first public reference to it occurs in a newsletter of June 8th, 1669: "It is now become a less secret that Colonel Talbot, of the Duke of York's Bedchamber, is married to Mrs Boynton, one of Her Majesty's Maids of Honour."

Why there should have been any secrecy at all we do not know. Gramont gives no clue. He merely dismisses the affair with the contemptuous words, "Talbot, without knowing why or wherefore, took to wife the languishing Boynton." Talbot probably knew as well as most other men the why and wherefore of his selection of a bride. At least there can have been no "noise of two rather troublesome brothers" necessary here, as Cominges told King Louis was the case with the Chevalier de Gramont. Perhaps, however, as has been suggested, the spite against Miss Boynton manifested in the *Memoirs* is attributable to Anthony Hamilton, not to the Chevalier himself.

CHAPTER VI

LADY HAMILTON

SIR GEORGE HAMILTON the younger, on his arrival in France, found his appointment as honourable as had been promised. The new corps of *Gens d'Armes Anglais* was under the direct patronage of Louis XIV., who was their Captain, Sir George being styled Captain-Lieutenant. To further his advancement in the French service, it was thought advisable that he should change his nationality, and on March 11th, 1668, a warrant was issued in England which permitted him to procure letters of denization in France. Soon after this Louis created him a Count.

As Lady Hamilton Frances no doubt found life at the Court in Paris very pleasant. A casual allusion to her there occurs in a letter written on August 14th, 1669, by Cosmo de' Medici, afterwards Grand Duke of Tuscany, to his friend Sir Bernard Gascoigne. Cosmo had just returned from England, where he had so much admired the beauties of Whitehall that

he had commissioned Lely to paint portraits of four of them for him. From Paris he writes: "I have paid a visit to the Comtesse de Gramont, sister to Mister Hamilton,* and to her sister-in-law; they are undoubtedly the most beautiful women of this Court."

Apart from her triumphs at the French Court, the care of her growing family occupied Frances. Not long after she came to Paris a second daughter followed Elizabeth; and there was later a third, if not more. To maintain their position and rear their children the Hamiltons required money, and here they experienced difficulties. Frances's father had died early in 1668, leaving the manor of Sandridge to his son John; but no other effects whatever. For this Frances was of course prepared. But a blow which had not been foreseen when she and her husband had left England was the non-payment of the pension from Charles II. A letter written at the beginning of 1670 by Ralph Montagu, English Ambassador in Paris, to Lord Arlington, the former Henry Bennet, shows that the pension had ceased—perhaps after the first instalment—and also throws doubt on the £3,000 a year mentioned by Henry Savile as the value of the French command to Hamilton.

"I have been several times spoke to by Sir George Hamilton," says Montagu, "to write to you concerning a pretension he has to a pension of five hundred

* *i. e.*, James.

pound a year, which the King promised and gave him upon his marriage, and which was cut off with the common calamity that attended all pensions at that time. I cannot but confess that I think he wants it extremely, and that I wish extremely that he could get it, but I am afraid the time for pensions in England at present is unseasonable, and therefore I advised him the most I could to defer his journey for some time; but he tells me his necessities are so urgent that he could not but try whether the King would do anything for him or no; so that since I could not stop him, I have endeavoured to compound the business, and have advised him to ask but for three hundred pound a year, for that five hundred is a very strong pension as things stand in our Court. The King here has some way or other heard of his pretensions, and three or four days ago sent him six hundred pistoles, and told him it was to help in his journey, and that he hoped the King of England would do his part, and that between them they might help him to subsist. I know the King our master loves Sir George Hamilton very well. The employment he has here is extreme honourable, and at long run he will make his fortune in it, but in the mean time it brings him in so little profit that, except he is helped some other way, it is impossible for him to hold out long in it. Considering your good nature, and the kindness you have for Sir George Hamilton, I need use no other arguments."

From another letter of Montagu's it is clear that Sir George Hamilton carried out his intention of visiting England, and that he returned to Paris again in March. Whether or not he had succeeded in obtaining any of the money due to him from his pension does not appear. King Charles, by assenting to a renewal of the Conventicle Act of which he so much disapproved, secured to himself in April a fresh grant of money from Parliament, and may have partly redeemed his promise of four years ago to his former page. The financial position of the Hamiltons, however, continued unsatisfactory, and the already-mentioned instalment of £600 from the Paymaster of the Forces in England must have been very welcome when it was paid in the autumn of 1670.

Sir George was now entrusted by Louis XIV. with a new task, the execution of which required no little circumspection and diplomacy. The treaties signed at Breda in 1667 had not been followed by peace on the Continent; nor had Louis's arrangement with Spain in the next year checked his ambitions. By the celebrated Treaty of Dover England and France united principally to humiliate the Dutch, but the French King was aware of the resentment which his conquests in the Netherlands must rouse up against him in Europe and made great efforts to strengthen his army. Ireland was one of the principal recruiting grounds of the day, the English Government being only too glad to see the disaffected inhabitants drafted off

into foreign service. No objection, therefore, was made when Louis asked for permission to raise a new regiment there through the agency of George Hamilton. The only obstacle was the unpopularity of the French alliance in England, where Louis was regarded with the utmost suspicion. For this reason it was necessary to keep the recruiting as private as possible.

"To-day arrived my Lord, *alias* Sir George, Hamilton, from Calais," says a letter from Dover on January 24th, 1671. There is no mention of Lady Hamilton either coming or returning with her husband, so that we may suppose her to have stayed in Paris. Sir George appears not to have proceeded to Ireland until June, for it was only on the 10th of that month that the King's orders were issued to the Lord Justices then administering the country. Their lordships were directed "to permit Sir George Hamilton, who after serving for many years was dismissed by reason of his religion and then betook himself to foreign service, to raise a foot regiment in Ireland of 1,500 men, besides officers, for the service of the Most Christian King, and to embark and transport the same." And, "because it is not convenient in this conjuncture of affairs that what is done in this matter be commonly known," they were further directed to "take care that the said levies be made and men transported with all the secrecy possible and to pass it as a matter of connivance only, avoiding as much as may be the public notice and observation of the world."

With the view of escaping publicity the French ships which were sent to fetch Hamilton's levies were ordered to Dingle, in remote Kerry, whence news would have taken a long time to travel. But instead they put into Kinsale, in consequence of which the government's "connivance" was made difficult, the jealousy of Spain was aroused, and the transportation of the men was delayed. The business was finished, however, by the beginning of September, when Sir Nicholas Armorer writes from Dublin to Sir Joseph Williamson, a Clerk of the Council and Keeper of the King's Paper Office, telling him that Count Hamilton's men are all complete. As for the Count himself, Armorer gives him a very high testimonial. "His diligence and conduct have been extraordinary, and I hope he will be truly so charactered to the French Ambassador by his friends in London. Lord Arlington is the chief he depends on, therefore pray give your mite to assist a worthy youth, whose discreet conduct here has done our master honour and merits much from the King he goes to serve, and our greatest fanatics pay him great respect for his civil carriage to all sorts of people."

With his fifteen hundred men Hamilton returned to France, and before long the opportunity came for him to prove the military merits of himself and his Irish recruits. The aggressions of Louis XIV. stirred up feelings of alarm which resulted in a coalition in favour of the Dutch, headed by the Emperor Ferdinand

himself and joined by nearly half of Europe. In the resulting grand war the "Régiment d'Hamilton," as it was called, was given its fill of fighting against the Imperialists on the Rhine. In 1674 it was engaged in two desperate struggles between Turenne and the Duke of Bournonville, at Sintzheim on June 16th and at Entzheim on October 4th, on both occasions playing a distinguished part in Turenne's victory. Hamilton himself suffered severely in the latter engagement, receiving three wounds and having his horse shot under him, and the regiment was shattered. While recovering from his injuries he made a trip to England. We hear of his arrival at Dover on Christmas Eve in the company of his brother-in-law Gramont and Louis de Duras, afterwards Earl of Feversham; and of his departure for Dieppe again on March 2nd with Gramont. On neither occasion is Lady Hamilton mentioned as travelling with him.

It is generally stated that George Hamilton was present at the battle of Turkheim, the masterpiece of Turenne's career. But as this was fought on January 5th (new style), 1675,* Hamilton cannot have been there, unless we reject the evidence for his visit to England. He returned to his command, however, in time to share in the final campaign of his chief. On July 27th Turenne was killed at Sassbach, on the eve of a victory. Hamilton was at his side when the fatal

* Equivalent to December 26th (old style), 1674, and therefore two days after Hamilton had reached Dover.

shot struck him down, and had indeed, not long before warned him of the dangerous position in which he stood. He had the melancholy satisfaction of covering and helping to make good the retreat of the French army after the death of the great man under whom he had learnt all that he knew of war and had risen to the rank of general; for by a brevet of March 12th he had become Brigadier of Infantry.

While her husband was thus distinguishing himself at the head of his regiment, Frances was trying to obtain for herself a position at the French Court which would help to relieve the pressure of family expenses. A month after the battle of Entzheim Sir William Lockhart wrote from the English Embassy in Paris to the new Secretary of State, Sir Henry Coventry, concerning Lady Hamilton. He had called upon her at Coventry's desire, he said, and found that she "postponed the application, as there was at present no vacancy."

The post which Frances had hoped to get was that of *Dame du Palais* to the French Queen. The application for it, if dropped in 1674, was renewed later and strongly supported by the English royal family. An interesting letter is in existence in the archives of the French Foreign Office, written by Courtin in London to Lionne in Paris and dated March 23rd, 1676. "The King of Great Britain and Monsieur the Duke of York," says Courtin, "ardently desire that the King will please make Lady Hamilton a

Dame du Palais. They have expressly charged me to make known to His Majesty the affection which they have for this lady and also the pleasure which they will feel if it pleases him to honour her with this kindness on their account. I replied to these Princes that the King would have already done so, had there been a place vacant, and that this was the only reason which had prevented the gratification of the lady according to their wish; that they might remember that the Marquise de la Vallière was placed in the Queen's household at the very time when they asked this favour for Lady Hamilton, and that the King's answer was that the number of the *Dames du Palais* was a fixed one. . . . The Princes answered that Lady Hamilton would be very unhappy if her husband, who so often exposed his life, should come to lose it, and that this gentleman was in the greatest anxiety when he thought that after his death his wife would remain burdened with a number of children, without resource or assistance, while if he saw her assured of so honourable a support, his heart would be lighter and he would be less troubled over the risks he ran; that they themselves shared these sentiments and did not doubt that His Majesty would do them this pleasure, if it were possible to do it. I assured them that this was so."

Lady Hamilton's visit to England toward the end of 1675, which is recorded in Evelyn's *Diary*, may have been made in order to obtain the support of Charles

and James for her application. No mention of it has been found outside the pages of Evelyn. Speaking of a journey to Dover on November 12th, he says: "There was in my Lady Ambassadress's* company my Lady Hamilton, a sprightly young lady, much in the good graces of the family, wife of that valiant and worthy gentleman Geo. Hamilton, not long after slain in the wars. She had been a maid of honour to the Duchess, and now turned Papist."

It is very curious that Courtin's above-quoted letter referring to the possibility of Hamilton's death in battle should have been written only three months before that possibility was realised. When Turenne fell at Sassbach, his former rival Condé became the leading French general, and it was under his supreme command that Hamilton made the campaign of 1676 in Alsace. Previously, however, at the beginning of the year he took a trip over to Ireland with the object of filling up the gaps in the Régiment d'Hamilton—a task even more difficult than the original levy of the regiment, since the English Parliament was now attempting to force King Charles into war with France and the Dutch and the Spaniards were pressing for the recall of all British subjects in the French ranks. Whatever was his success in Ireland, Hamilton on April 12th left Portsmouth to take up his command

* This was Lady Berkeley of Stratton, Berkeley being "designed Ambassador Extraordinary for France and Plenipotentiary for the General Treaty of Peace at Nimeguen."

again. During his absence he had been raised to the position of *Maréchal de Camp*. He did not live long to enjoy his new dignity. At the beginning of June he took part in the battle of Zebernstieg and was engaged in covering the French retreat on Saverne when he was killed by a musket-shot.

George Hamilton left behind him in the French army a very honourable name, and as he was personally liked, he was deeply regretted. The news of his death reached Frances in Paris, and there is no reason to think that it was not a heavy blow to her. Their marriage had been a love-match, as has been said; and those who speak of Hamilton as an unfaithful husband, who left his wife exposed to the temptations of the Court and the persecutions of royal admirers, ignore the dates of such intrigues as are imputed to him—all previous to 1665—and of her residence with the Duchess of York. The people who saw her in her first widowhood had the best opportunities of judging how she received the news of her loss. There are three letters which bear witness to the depth of her grief. On June 13th Lord Berkeley, then in France, wrote to Coventry that "Lady Hamilton is in Brisbane's house, distracted for the loss of her husband." Brisbane had been sent to Paris as a commissioner to settle disputes arising from the capture by French privateers of vessels flying the English flag, and remained to become secretary to the Embassy. Why Frances should have been in his house it is difficult to imagine.

The other two letters are both written by Madame de Sévigné, at the beginning of July. In the first she says that Lady Hamilton is "inconsolable and ruined beyond all hope"; in the second, that she rouses everyone's pity, being "left with six children, without any resources." This mention of six children is curious, for we nowhere hear the names of more than three—Elizabeth, Frances, and Mary.* Even with three young children, however, Frances would be in a bad plight, and the English Court was quick to show its sympathy with her. A warrant of July 7th, 1676, makes a grant of "the dignity of a countess of Ireland to Dame Hamilton, relict of Sir George Hamilton, for her life, by the name of Baroness Hamilton of Rosse and Countess of Bantry." For some reason this honour conferred upon her by Charles II. has been overlooked by biographers of Frances Jennings.†

Early in the spring following Sir George's death, his widow paid a visit to England. On March 29th,

* There certainly can only have been three in July, 1677 (see the royal warrant quoted below), and therefore, unless three others died between July, 1676, and July, 1677, Madame de Sévigné must have made a mistake. She does not seem to have had any personal acquaintance with Lady Hamilton.

† In the warrant to Lord Peterborough concerning her daughters' privileges she is styled Countess of *Berehaven;* but nine days later, in a warrant to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, she is again called "Baroness Hamilton of Ross and Countess of Bantry." (*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, under dates July 9th and July 18th, 1677.) Lady Baillie-Hamilton informs me that, in a letter to her, Mr. Ashworth Burke says: "No patent ever passed the seals for Dame Frances Hamilton as Countess of Berehaven or Countess of Bantry." Nevertheless Dangeau (*Journal* I., 228) states that she kept her title of "comtesse de Vantry" until Talbot was created Earl of Tyrconnel; and at the coronation of James II. and Mary she appears as Countess of Bantry.

1677, a correspondent at Dover announces to Sir Joseph Williamson the arrival from Calais on the previous Tuesday's packet-boat of some "passengers of quality," including Lady Hamilton. The object of her journey is shown by a document still surviving at the Record Office, among the Domestic State Papers of the reign of Charles II. On June 18th we find referred to the Lord Treasurer the "petition of the Countess of Bantry for a pension of 500*l.* per annum, which she was informed at her marriage to Count Hamilton His Majesty would grant her if she outlived him." The result of the petition does not appear, but a warrant survives granting to her daughters Elizabeth, Frances and Henrietta (elsewhere always called Mary) the privileges and precedence of the daughters of a Countess in Ireland. This was presumably necessary owing to Sir George's change of nationality nine years previously.

After this visit to England in the hope of getting the money which she urgently needed for the maintenance of her three little girls and the upkeep of her own position, Frances disappears from view for a while. Doubtless she returned to Paris, where we next hear of her four years later. In England she had found the affairs of her own family considerably altered since she had last seen them. Her sister Barbara had married Edward Griffith, afterwards secretary to Prince George of Denmark. Her elder brother John, after enjoying for six years only the little which his father had left to him of the Jennings property, had died in

1674, handing on Sandridge to his junior, Ralph, who followed him to the grave in 1677, possibly while Frances was still in England. Sarah had been appointed a maid of honour to the new Duchess of York, and her mother had been allowed to have apartments at St. James's Palace—to shelter her from debt, it was said—until at the end of 1676 a violent quarrel broke out between the two. Mrs. Jennings was not altogether to blame, for she professed concern over two unfortunate accidents which had befallen two of the maids at Court; and vowing her daughter should not suffer the same fate, attempted to take her away. Sarah, on her side, called her mother a mad woman and declared that if she were not put out of St. James's she herself would run away. An attempt at reconciliation failed, and the daughter was victorious, Mrs. Jennings being commanded to leave the Court without Sarah's company.

It was thus to no united family that Frances came in the spring of 1677. Nor was she likely to increase the harmony. She was now a Roman Catholic; and one of the strongest prejudices of the Jenningses, whatever their personal character might be, was their hatred of Rome. On this point, at least, Sarah and "Mother Haggy" agreed. Frances alone dared to break away from the tradition, and, in consequence, cut herself off from the rest, though in later years she and Sarah seem always to have retained an affection for one another.

om an engraving by W. Rand, after the painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller in Lord Spencer's collection.

SARAH JENNINGS, DUCHESS OF MARLBOROUGH.

CHAPTER VII

TALBOT AS IRISH AGENT

IN a previous chapter we mentioned Richard Talbot's marriage out of its due place. We now return to the point where we previously left him, in the company of the Duke and Duchess of York, at the beginning of August, 1665. Talbot must have proceeded to Ireland very soon after the arrival of the party at York; for on August 18th we find him in Dublin, writing of himself to Sir Joseph Williamson as "a man here in a corner of the world," but manifesting his continued activity in the task of making a fortune even in that corner.

"If I could serve you in this country," he tells Williamson, "I would do so, and when the settlement is made here, if anything be left at the bottom of the basket (as you tell me there will), I may chance find a snip for a friend." These "snips," no doubt, were charged with a commission to the industrious

Talbot. But it would be unfair to brand him as "one of the most mercenary and crafty of mankind"—the words are Macaulay's—for his transactions in Irish estates. Every age has its own form of jobbery, which to it appears venial compared with other forms; and the age of Charles II. refused to condemn this trafficking severely. Few public men refused to take a share in it. Williamson was no more proof against the temptation than Arlington. In another letter to him Talbot says jocosely: "I hope before long to get you as much land in Ireland as will make you a 40*s.* freeholder, and so a juryman here."

As for Arlington, we have heard of some of his dealings with Talbot in 1662-3, including the "discovery of a great sum—£10,000—to be got here." This piece of booty was evidently difficult to secure, since in 1666 it was still uncaptured. In the August of that year Talbot was on a visit to Lord Orrery at Charleville, and on the 21st Orrery wrote to Arlington: "I had to-day a council of war with him about your £10,000 affair. I find he has put it in the only way which it could succeed for you; and I am not in despair of its success."

It was only by the connivance of the Secretary of State and such powerful personages that the dealings of Talbot in Irish land were possible; for Ormonde set his face resolutely against them and, despite all his enemies said to his discredit, was incorruptible. Had he been otherwise, it would not have been

necessary, in the eyes of the money-makers, to remove him from Dublin Castle; and without the help of these his political opponents might not have been able to bring about his removal.

Talbot returned to his duties in attendance on the Duke of York in 1667, a year full of incident for James, who during its course lost his two infant sons, saw his father-in-law ruined, had an attack of smallpox, and began to feel seriously the effects of Buckingham's animosity towards him. The relations between various personages at this period are complex and subject to rapid changes. But Buckingham was a constant enemy to James, as he was to Clarendon, from long before the Restoration. Among others temporary alliances were occasionally formed in order to undermine the power of someone disliked by them in common. Thus Buckingham and his cousin Lady Castlemaine, on the worst of terms with one another in 1666, in the following year were both in league with Arlington, William Coventry and others to destroy Clarendon. Before long the cousins had reverted to their normal state of enmity, with the result that when Buckingham made his monstrous attempt to persuade the King to legitimise Lucy Walter's son, Lady Castlemaine became a friend—we might almost say a patron—of the Duke of York and his Duchess.

Out of Ireland Richard Talbot's position was as yet too humble to allow him to take a great share in public affairs, though Marvel considered him of

sufficient importance to mention his name in some doggerel verse published in 1667.* His post in James's household kept him under restraint. The Duke's party was already on the defensive against a growing army of assailants, and his adherents had little scope for intrigue compared with those on the other side. Fond as he was of this species of diplomacy, Talbot was not of such stuff as Henry Brounker and William Coventry, both of whom, when they had by their ill-conduct compelled James to dismiss them, turned his bitter foes. At no point in his career do we find Talbot engaged in opposition to the Duke's interests—a fact which no doubt must condemn him in the judgment of those who take the conventional view of James II.

The mentions of Talbot's name are very rare between the times of his return to Whitehall and of his marriage. In September, 1668, he is heard of at Bath, but what he was doing there is unknown. Where we should have expected to see him take a hand is in the game against Ormonde, which resulted in his removal from the Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland. It is difficult to believe that Talbot was not involved at all in this, in view of his past quarrels with Ormonde, his activity, both before and after, against the cause which Ormonde so steadfastly upheld—the maintenance of the Settle-

* "The Papists, but of those the House had none,
Else Talbot offered to have led them on."
A. Marvel, *Last Instructions to a Painter.*

ment of Ireland—and his close association with the chief enemies of the Lord-Lieutenant. But apart from a statement in Carte, quoted below, we are without evidence of his complicity.

Ormonde's fall was threatened from the moment when the broken Clarendon walked homeward through the Privy Garden at Whitehall amid the laughter of Lady Castlemaine, Lord Arlington, Bab May and others. The Cabal ministry, which took Clarendon's place, was determined to oust Ormonde, the only one left of Charles's old advisers; and particularly eager was Buckingham, who wanted his two posts as Steward of the Household and Lord-Lieutenant. Lady Castlemaine, still omnipotent with the King—"not as a mistress, for she scorns him," says Pepys, "but as a tyrant to command him"—had her own fierce grievance against Ormonde, who had stopped a grant to her of Phœnix Park and had persuaded Charles to make it the summer residence of the Lords-Lieutenant. With Lady Castlemaine, Talbot will before long be discovered to have some sort of compact for their mutual advantage. As for his relations with her cousin, Carte states that "he [Talbot] and all the Roman Catholic party joined with Buckingham in inventing and casting all the calumnies that could contribute to lessen the Duke of Ormonde's interest with the King."

Ormonde was warned by his friends early in 1668 to come to England to protect himself, but delayed

until the beginning of May. His arrival no doubt prevented his immediate fall, such was the influence which he had over even so inconstant a friend as Charles. Finally in August, 1669, Ormonde, still in London, was told privately of the intention to supersede him at Dublin Castle by John, Lord Robarts of Truro, and on the following day the announcement was made public at a council meeting, though in language extremely complimentary to the dismissed viceroy.

Perhaps the chief reason why we do not hear of Richard Talbot prominently in connection with the campaign against Ormonde is because he had allowed himself to be distracted temporarily from both politics and fortune-making. He could no longer boast that he "was not one to marry himself"; for in the spring of 1669, as has already been told, he took to wife Katherine Boynton. Once married, he resumed his busy character. About the end of August he left with his wife for Ireland, where at last the way was clear for a more vigorous onslaught against the Act of Settlement. Carte represents him as going over specially to hunt up material for pretences to set aside the Act.*

His brother Peter had already begun to break the ground. The ex-Jesuit, although his opportunities for exercising his political talents had been curtailed

* His only official post in Ireland at this time seems to have been the captaincy of a troop of horse, to which he was commissioned about the end of 1669.

in 1662, had devoted his time profitably to his proper career, and being a really clever theologian, had obtained high preferment. He was named by the Pope Archbishop of Dublin, being consecrated at Antwerp on May 2nd, 1669. He had no intention, however, of avoiding politics on his return to Ireland. "Peter," says Carte, "must have divested himself of his nature if he would have refrained from meddling in state intrigues." In the course of the year a pamphlet appeared, entitled *A Narrative of the Sale and Settlement of Ireland*, attacking both Clarendon and Ormonde, and complaining bitterly of the sufferings of the Irish. Ormonde's biographer grows very indignant over this publication, about whose authorship there seems to be no doubt.* The attacks on the late Lord-Lieutenant were, indeed, not only unjust, but ungrateful. But the Talbots were now completely estranged from Ormonde, especially as Sir Robert, who had generally exercised a restraining influence

* "Whoever was the author of the narrative," asserts Carte, "has much to answer for an aspersion on the Duke of Ormonde, whom he represents as opposing the Irish being included in the English Act of Indemnity, out of the corrupt influence which the Irish Commissioners' promises of a great sum of money, and of that vast estate which he had since got by the Act of Settlement, had upon His Grace. . . . If P. Talbot was really the author"—and Carte states later that he admitted he was—"he deserves a name I do not care to give any man, for he charges here a fact which he knew to be false; for, as it was owing to the Duke of Ormonde's interposing in favour of the deserving Irish, when the Act of Indemnity was under consideration, that some clauses offered for excluding all the Irish Roman Catholics from a capacity of restitution by His Majesty's favour were not added to the Bill, so it appears under P. Talbot's own hand that he then acknowledged the preservation of the Irish nation from utter ruin was entirely owing to His Grace." (*Ormond*, IV., 369.)

upon his juniors, was now either dead or on the point of death.

Archbishop Peter Talbot's libel and another of a similar character, the authorship of which is not stated, caused Ormonde both pain and trouble; for the vastness of his estates in Ireland made people prone to believe an accusation that he had abused his position to add to his inheritance. He was also forced to watch, with very little power now to ward them off, the repeated blows struck at the Act of Settlement. The hopes of the Irish were fixed partly on the sympathies of the King, partly on the weakness of the Lords Lieutenant who followed Ormonde. Robarts, the first of these, is called by Clarendon "a sullen, morose man, intolerably proud . . . and hard to live with"; and by Gramont "an old, snarling, troublesome, peevish fellow." According to Peter Talbot, on the other hand, he was "a sagacious, rather severe man, but an upholder of the liberty of conscience, although popularly considered a Presbyterian." His experiences in Ireland were unfortunate. When first appointed as deputy for Albemarle in July, 1660, his apparent haughtiness had exasperated the Irish, and Charles had been compelled to remove him, consoling him with the post of Privy Seal. After his second appointment in 1669 he made quite unsuccessful attempts to conciliate the Irish nobility and gentry, and the complaints made by those of them resident in London procured his recall before he had been in

Dublin a year. He "had the hard fate," says Carte, "to render himself disagreeable in Ireland by his conduct there, and at the same time lose his interest at the Court of England by his absence."

To succeed Robarts, Lord Berkeley of Stratton was sent to Ireland in May, 1670. Berkeley was a man with whom the Irish expected to be able to do much more than with Robarts. The Talbots knew him well through the association of them all with the Duke of York, and they believed that he, like themselves, would be willing to work in concert with Lady Castlemaine, who combined her insatiable greed for money and land with a desire to help those of the religion which she had adopted at the end of 1663. Berkeley, as a matter of fact, was not as pliable as was expected. But he was anxious to keep his post and endeavoured not to quarrel with those who might cause him to lose it. When he landed at Dublin in May, 1670, Peter Talbot waited upon him and was well received. He ventured even to appear before the Lord-Lieutenant in council in his character of Roman Catholic archbishop—conduct unprecedented since the Reformation, says Carte, who adds that Berkeley did not care for Peter,* but was afraid of his influence with

* In a letter to King Charles on September 24th, 1670, Berkeley speaks of his efforts against the "Kernes and Tories" infesting Ireland, and of the success of his blended severity and lenity towards them. As his agent in conciliating them he has "used one Oliver Plunkett, who is not such a bonerges [*sc.* Boanerges] as Peter Talbot or Peter Walsh." (*Calendar of State Papers, Ireland.*)

the Duke of Buckingham and the power of his friends at Court.

As for Richard Talbot, "apprehending that the Lord-Lieutenant was a creature of Lady Castlemaine's," he procured a letter from the royal mistress proposing certain projects—which, we may be sure, promised pecuniary advantage to herself, and possibly were concerned with her long-cherished desire to compel Charles to carry out his early promise of a grant of Phœnix Park to her. "The Colonel, delivering the letter, was answered by the Lord Berkeley that he would serve the Lady Castlemaine in what he could, but he was afraid it was not in his power to serve her in the particulars recommended. Talbot upon this was in a great huff, and gave himself airs of resentment."

According to Carte, Berkeley, unlike Robarts, expressed his respect for the Duke of Ormonde—which we should hardly have expected from Berkeley's previous record—and "showed such countenance to those who were known to be his friends and were in office as became a well-bred man and an equal governor."* In consequence the Colonel was offended, and had the assurance to ask Berkeley one day whether he was the King's or the Duke of Ormonde's Lieutenant. "Lord Berkeley could not but

* Our new Lord-Lieutenant, Sir Nicholas Armorer assures Williamson, give great content to all honest and loyal folks. "Under the rosse"—orthography is not Armorer's strong point—"the Talbots find themselves to seek and are fallen from their hopes."

be provoked at the insolence of the question (which the other bragged of publicly), but thought fit to smother his resentment and to keep measures with persons who he was apprehensive might be too strong for him in case of an open dispute. The two brothers, indeed, presumed much on their power at Court; Peter corresponded constantly with the Duke of Buckingham, and made no scruple to show His Grace's letters, desiring him to hasten into England and to tell his friends that Lord Berkeley would not continue in Ireland six months, that the Duke of Bucks was to be Lieutenant and to come over for a time, and then upon his return to leave the Earl of Orrery his deputy."

It was a remarkable combination which included Buckingham, the Presbyterian (if only when it suited him to be so); Orrery, the one-time Cromwellian commander; the Roman Catholic Talbots; and "the Lady," an ardent proselyte to the same faith, if still quite an unrepentant sinner. Self-interest was the only bond which kept them together, although we do not gather that Archbishop Peter hoped for any pecuniary profit out of the alliance. Both he and Richard, indeed, may be credited with other than merely selfish motives in their scheming. Peter, after his elevation to the archbishopric of Dublin, forgot his early attitude of independence towards the Vatican and was now a zealous upholder of the full papal claims and a persecutor of the

Remonstrants.* Berkeley, timorous and guarded as he might be, was yet an obstacle in the way of his crusade, and he therefore wished to see someone else in his place. As for Richard, it was doubtless difficult for his enemies to believe that his methods of making a fortune quickly were accompanied by any nobler designs. Yet the case is far from unparalleled, either before or after the time of Richard Talbot. His ambition required the command of money; but, while filling his pocket, he did not lose sight of his political object, to overthrow the Settlement which involved the oppression of his co-religionists in Ireland. Bribes he both took and gave, but always in the same interest. He can never be said to have sold his principles. Had he only done so, his peculation—if we must use so hard a name—would have been forgotten. With the additional sale of his religious convictions, he might have embraced the victorious side in 1689 and become a character esteemed in history.

Richard had a more difficult task in the political sphere than his brother had in the ecclesiastical. Berkeley was forced by orders from the King to call

* *i.e.*, those of the Irish Papist clergy who, after the Restoration, drew up a "remonstrance" to Charles II., acknowledging him as their rightful king, to be obeyed in all temporal affairs, and openly renouncing every foreign power, papal or princely, which should pretend to free them from that obligation or to license them to bear arms against the King's authority. Both Ormonde and Clarendon had naturally welcomed the Remonstrance, not without a hope that it would lead to a division of the Roman Catholics in Ireland which would prevent their union against the Government. See Carte, *Ormond*, IV., 614.

a halt in the persecution of the Remonstrants; but, as Charles's action was prompted by the advice of Ormonde,* Berkeley grew jealous and did no more than the letter of his instructions compelled him to do. Consequently Peter Talbot and the other extremists in the Roman Catholic hierarchy went on their way with little interference from the Lord-Lieutenant.

On the other hand, the task of righting the wrongs which the Irish claimed to have suffered through the Acts of Settlement and Explanation proved very difficult. It was easy for Richard Talbot to pick up estates for his allies in high office in England. But when it came to getting an estate, or compensation in place of such, for Irish Roman Catholics who had been ignored by the Acts, it was another matter. A just complaint availed little; and bribery was beyond the means of most of the aggrieved parties. Earlier in the day, as we have seen, money had been expended by many, in the shape of bonds given to Talbot and

* The Remonstrants had appealed to Ormonde in England, and he had not refused them the benefit of such influence as he still possessed, looking on them as the loyalists among the Roman Catholic clergy—which they undoubtedly were. Peter Talbot, however, protested that any proceedings which had been taken against them had been at the instance of their religious superiors and on account of their dissolute lives. On this matter Ormonde wrote in a letter of July 19th, 1670, to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland: "Your Grace well knows that that sort of people never want calumnies to load those with that are not of their principles, or having been of them, quit them; which undoubtedly is now the case. Else why was Father Gernon removed from Dublin for his ill life, to make room for F[ather] Tom Talbot, for the sobriety and sanctity of his? These, my lord, are subterfuges too gross to pass upon a state."

other "undertakers," and a certain number of people had been restored or compensated. The multitude who remained unsatisfied after the passing of the Act of Settlement were faced by tremendous obstacles, actual possession, the power of the purse, political influence, and popular religious prejudice all being on the side of their opponents. It was decided to try what could be done by a direct petition to the King, who was still believed to be anxious to show sympathy towards the Irish cause, in spite of his previous abandonment of it for expediency's sake. Richard Talbot was chosen as the representative to carry the petition over to England; the signatures to the resolution of November 25th, which authorised him to do so, including the names of Lords Westmeath, Mountgarret, Barnewall, Netterville, Trimleston and Dongan, and forty-four gentlemen, one of whom was William Talbot, *i.e.*, Sir William, Sir Robert's only son, who had recently succeeded to the baronetcy on his father's death.

The petition set forth that the signatories had been dispossessed of their lands by "the late usurped powers" for their loyalty, and that they had faithfully served the King and suffered for him at home and abroad; and that for want of a just presentation of their cases their estates had, contrary to His Majesty's declared intentions, been kept by others, so that they were in extreme misery for want of subsistence. An impartial tribunal was asked for, to hear their

grievances, and in the meantime it was requested that all further grants of undisposed land in Ireland should be stopped.

Carte complains of the participation of both Dongan and Richard Talbot in this petition. Dongan, he says, although he had been restored to his estate by the Court of Claims on Ormonde's certificate in his favour, was active in inspiring the Irish to attempt a repeal of the Acts of Settlement; and Talbot, "who had received more benefit and advantage than any one man of Ireland of his quality, was the chief undertaker."

Talbot had other business which required his presence in London besides his commission on behalf of his fellow-countrymen. On November 22nd, 1670, Lord Aungier* writes from Dublin to Williamson: "Dick Talbot will soon be with you, for he resolves within very few days to be on shipboard and to carry with him, as 'tis said, severe things against some who sting him in his business before the House of Lords. Thus you see you are like to have no sport there but what we furnish you from hence."

This business before the House of Lords, from which Aungier anticipated sport, was an echo from the earlier days of Talbot's advocacy of the claims of innocent Papists in Ireland. Among the manuscripts of the

* Described by Talbot in a letter to Williamson as "the slyest little creature in the world." Talbot had probably found him a hard man to deal with in the affair of the Clanmalier estate.

House of Lords, under the date April 8th, 1670, is a "petition and appeal of Sir Robert Nugent, Bart., against Colonel Richard Talbot." According to this, Nugent's father had an estate in Ireland—Sir Robert appears elsewhere as of Corcreagh, county Roscommon—which was sequestrated by "the late usurpers." After the Restoration, father and son set about recovering it. One John Talbot having represented to them that his brother, Colonel Richard, was a man of great influence, it was agreed that the Colonel should prosecute the Nugents' claim, at his own expense, but on the understanding that he should receive £3,000 if he obtained possession of the estate for them before the father's death, £2,000 if after. Talbot spent about £10 in the matter, Sir Robert alleges, for which he paid him £100; but left him to prosecute the claim himself, which cost him over £400. On the recovery of the estate Talbot claimed £2,000 (Nugent senior being dead), and actually obtained a decree in Chancery for part of this. The case having been taken to the House of Lords, Talbot "hath ever since prosecuted Sir Robert more vigorously and laid wait for him in all sea-ports to prevent his coming into England to prosecute his appeal, threatening to clap him up, so that he dare not adventure over to attend the House, though he is ready to be heard."

Such is Nugent's complaint. Talbot's answer is to contend that the decree in Chancery cannot be

reversed (for certain technical reasons), and to repudiate the allegation that he had any influence over the Commissioners in Ireland; an allegation which he declares to be dishonouring to the Commissioners. "If the petitioner or his father," concludes Talbot, "overvalued his industry upon a secret opinion that he had such influence, which he believes no man living ever had (those honourable persons being never swayed, in his belief, by any consideration but those of justice and equity), yet, if the petitioner had a mind to think otherwise, that can be no reason to avoid his bond for payment of the respondent's pains." As we hear no more of the case it seems probable that Talbot, after his arrival in England, successfully used his influence to defeat Nugent's appeal.

Talbot sailed from Dublin on December 6th, in the company of Sir Ellis Leighton, secretary to Lord Berkeley, and Sir John Temple. It is fortunate for Talbot's reputation that he had not left earlier. On December 6th occurred Blood's dastardly attempt to murder the Duke of Ormonde. Had Talbot been in London at the time, we should doubtless read in all the accepted works of history that he was gravely suspected of being implicated in the plot; especially since the general opinion at the time of the attempt was, as Carte says, "that Blood was put upon this assassination by the Duke of Buckingham and the Duchess of Cleveland, who both hated the Duke of Ormonde mortally." Talbot being connected with

the newly created Duchess and her cousin in some schemes, his enemies would naturally associate him with them in all, if there were an opportunity.

No time was lost in presenting the petition of the Irish nobility and gentry. On January 18th, 1671, Talbot appeared before the King in council and delivered it to him. Charles and the majority of the Privy Councillors considered the requests reasonable for the appointment of an impartial commission to hear the petitioners' grievances and for the stoppage meanwhile of all further assignments of Irish land. A committee of thirteen was chosen from the Privy Council, who at their first meeting on January 21st had Talbot before them, with a list of those for whom he appeared and his proposals for their relief. Talbot stated that he represented a vast number of innocent men who had been condemned before their cases had been heard, and proposed as a remedy an amendment of the Acts of Settlement. On this point he asked to be heard by his counsel.

Ormonde, who was one of the committee, at once opposed the motion, maintaining that it was better to uphold the Settlement, in spite of its few errors, than to waste time and money in doing the work all over again, while bringing the trade of Ireland to a standstill in the meantime. Arlington, too, was alarmed at the idea of the work involved by a new Settlement and complained that the petitioners were going too far. But the majority again favoured the

application, and Talbot was allowed to introduce his counsel, Ayloffe by name. According to Carte, Ayloffe's presentation of the case of the unrestored Irish was pompous and injudicious, ignored the Rebellion entirely, and made out all his clients to be loyalists, whose restitution could not be denied without a gross breach of faith. Ormonde felt compelled in reply to call attention to the disloyal acts of the Irish, such as the violation of peace terms, the repudiation of the King's authority, in his person, by the clerical faction of the Confederates, his excommunication by those clerics, and so on.

Finally it was decided to submit the papers concerning the matter to the Attorney-General, Sir Heneage Finch. His opinion was promptly given on February 1st and was against the petitioners' claims. But Charles and the Council as a whole did not choose to be guided by Finch. "These obstructions," says Carte, "made it necessary to proceed in another manner, and to leave the Duke of Ormonde out of the committee." A new and smaller body was selected from the Privy Council, comprising only Buckingham, Ashley, Anglesey, Hollis and Secretary Trevor, with the addition of Lauderdale later. To these was entrusted the task of examining the question of the Settlement of Ireland, from first to last, and of reporting to the King thereon. On June 18th they presented to Charles a report which Carte finds "very uncertain and general." But they would indeed have

been a collection of geniuses had they been able to produce any other than a general report on such a question in four months' time. A recommendation by them, which Charles adopted, was that he should authorise some persons to send for witnesses, records, etc., and to require information from officials in England or Ireland without fee or expense. Such authority was given to the Commission itself, after it had been increased by Prince Rupert and Sir Thomas Chicheley; and pending the collection of evidence matters stood over until the autumn.

To prepare for his next meeting with the Commission, which was to reassemble on September 21st, Talbot returned to Dublin, getting there before the agents despatched by the Commissioners to collect evidence.* The date of his arrival is given in a letter to Williamson from Robert Leigh, one of Talbot's customers in the estate business. "The Colonel," writes Leigh on July 8th, "landed here last night, but went straight to his house four miles off, where his lady is." This brief mention is the only reference which we find to the former Katherine Boynton between her

* In Appendix C will be found a document stated by William King to have been "found in Col. Talbot's house, July 1, 1671." If this date be correct, it is certainly curious that a search should have been made (as is implied) in Talbot's house at this period, when the collectors of evidence had not yet arrived in Ireland, and when, moreover, Talbot was not on his trial, nor even in disgrace. The document, which contains suggestions, from the Roman Catholic point of view, as to the right policy to be pursued in the government of Ireland, is attributed to Peter Talbot and is interesting to compare with the actual procedure of his brother when he became Lord Deputy.

marriage in 1669 and her death nine years later. As a wife she made no history, from which we are perhaps justified in inferring that the domestic life of herself and her husband was happy.

Talbot found that there had been considerable excitement in Dublin over the idea of tearing in pieces the Acts of Settlement.* An instance of this is furnished by another letter from Leigh to Williamson in February. Leigh says: "The petition lately delivered by Col. Talbot has made no small noise here. Yesterday morning, on occasion of discourse thereof, Sir Henry Ingoldsby and Mr. Thomas Cusack, nephew to Col. Talbot, fought a duel, when, it's said, the latter in closing broke his sword, but notwithstanding was too strong for the other. However, both came home unhurt, but 'tis feared the occasion will breed much greater animosities yet."

The alarm continued to increase among the parties left or put in possession of Irish land by the Acts of Settlement, and petitions flowed in to the Privy Council in Dublin for transmission to London, all demanding the maintenance of the Acts. The Roman Catholics, on their side, feeling secure of favour at Court and in the English ministry, directed their attention to damaging the reputation of the faithful champion of the Settlement. Carte complains bitterly of "the

* The phrase is Sir Robert Southwell's. In 1682 he writes to Sir John Perceval, recalling the time when "the [Irish] agent, Col. Talbot, by support in Court, was at the brink of tearing the Acts of Settlement in pieces."

idle and malicious reports spread at this time industriously by Colonel Talbot and his party." Archbishop Peter had laid the foundation for the assault on Ormonde's good name. It remained to procure witnesses to prove the allegation that he had acquired land by an abuse of his power. "Colonel Talbot," says Carte, "with all his industry and expertness in finding out convenient witnesses . . . and backed with the interest and endeavours of the whole body of the Irish throughout the kingdom, was not able to find out above two, at a time when the estates of a great part of the nation were at stake, and a substantial witness for that purpose was very sure of making his fortune."

It must be remembered that Carte is vehemently hostile to Talbot, and therefore some discount should certainly be made before we accept his charges against him. Unfortunately, however, we cannot but feel that there was a basis of fact under the accusations, and the only defence which can be made for Talbot is that he was so blinded by zeal for his clients that he hesitated at nothing which might turn to their profit. As will be seen, however, he did not even now make an unrelenting enemy of the generous-hearted Ormonde.

On the reassembling of the Commission in September, 1671, the evidence collected in Ireland was brought forward, and Talbot appeared with his witnesses. The case against Ormonde was soon proved to be baseless. One of the witnesses absconded into Ireland

on the discovery of a forged document. The other, a Captain James Nolan, was disconcerted by an order from the Council to produce proof of his allegations. All he could do was to petition the King to be pleased to command Colonel Talbot to declare his knowledge of the matter. "This was granted," says Carte, "but Talbot, apprehensive that it might prove at last a scandalous affair, and that he himself might possibly be involved in the censure which it deserved, thought fit to pretend business in Ireland, and set out for that kingdom."

This was near the end of 1671. The stranded Nolan in January petitioned for an examination of evidence in Dublin; but the Commission was tired of the matter, and after a last attempt by Nolan to extract from Sir Bernard Gascoigne a statement in writing as to what Talbot had said to him before leaving for Ireland, the complaint against Ormonde was dismissed as false and scandalous.

The Commission continued its investigations into the general question of the Settlement of Ireland. But Talbot, as twice before after encounters with Ormonde, found it expedient to devote his attention awhile to other business, or, at least, to other branches of the same business.

CHAPTER VIII

INTRIGUES AND DISASTERS

RICHARD TALBOT'S work as accredited agent for the Irish Roman Catholics—for the assumption of which title he was to pay dearly before long—was not confined merely to the production of evidence before the Privy Council commission. But as, from the circumstances of the time, much of his labour was necessarily carried on underground, it is exceedingly difficult to trace what he was doing. Among the State Papers of Charles II. there remain some very curious notes in the handwriting of Sir Joseph Williamson, referring to some intrigue on a grand scale, though its precise object is not apparent. In it are involved Lord Orrery; his nephew, Lord Ranelagh; Lord Carlingford*; Talbot; and the Duchess of Cleveland. Orrery had been a friend of Ormonde until 1668, when he not only fell out with

* The Lord Taaffe of pre-Restoration days.

him, but was impeached in the English House of Commons for fraudulent money transactions in his post of President of Munster. The King saved him from danger by a prorogation of Parliament; and Orrery entered into a league with Lauderdale, then in great influence over Charles, and the Duke of Buckingham. Lauderdale was on excellent terms with the Duchess of Cleveland, while Her Grace, in spite of her bitter quarrels with Buckingham, never let them stand in the light of profitable combinations with him. Ranelagh, like his uncle once a friend of Ormonde, on his arrival in England in 1670 joined Buckingham's clique. With the aid of Ashley and others a very powerful league was formed, directed partly against Ormonde and Arlington, and partly to the personal enrichment of the leaguers.

In making an alliance with such people Richard Talbot found himself in very bad company. Concerning the Duchess, Buckingham, and Lauderdale, it is not necessary to prove this. Orrery's connection with Cromwell appears to have caused many writers to close their eyes to the fundamental dishonesty of character which underlay his considerable talents. Richard Jones, third Viscount, and afterwards first Earl of Ranelagh, is described in Williamson's notes as "very treacherous and false, wholly his uncle Orrery's." His gross swindling in connection with the farm of the Irish revenues which he persuaded Charles to grant him soon

after this* is sufficient evidence with regard to his financial corruption. As for his sexual morality, a contemporary, wishing to show how bad was the character of Sir Edward Seymour, Speaker of the House of Commons, can find nothing more convincing to say than that he was "worse for women than my Lord Ranelagh."

Williamson's notes are attributed by the Editor of the *Calendar of State Papers* (*Domestic*) to the end of December, 1671. They are clearly written after Talbot had reached London from Dublin in September; while they make no mention of his return to Ireland when the witness Nolan broke down. As has been said, the object of the intrigue to which they refer is not apparent. This is partly due to the fact that the memoranda, intended only for the writer's own eye, pay little regard to grammar or construction. Some "discoveries" are mentioned, which are to be "played into the Duchess of Cleveland's hand." Then

* Talbot's help in persuading the King to grant this farm was evidently what purchased Ranelagh's assistance in the campaign against the Acts of Settlement. A paper in the handwriting of Lord O'Brien (Henry, Viscount Ibrackan, eldest son of the Earl of Thomond) is to be seen in the *Calendar of State Papers* (*Domestic*), 1673-5, containing notes apparently for a speech in the committee of the whole House at Dublin in 1674. O'Brien says that it is "notoriously known that Lord Ranelagh entered into a strict friendship with Col. Talbot [who] came over to negotiate and solicit the affairs of the Popish party in Ireland"; that Talbot helped Ranelagh to his farm of the revenue; that Ranelagh "immediately after his entrance into the Treasury paid the said Col. Talbot £2,000, which Lord Aungier refused to pay"; and that Ranelagh subsequently procured another £2,000 for Talbot. On September 27th, 1673, Lord Essex wrote to Lord Arlington, after speaking of certain payments of money in Ireland: "I hear also of £2,000 more either for the Lord Chamberlain or Col. Talbot." Talbot was the probable recipient, being on the point of leaving for France.

Carlingford—who, "whatever he pretends towards my Lord of Ormonde, is body and soul an Orreryan" —"endeavours to play my Lord Berkeley into the Duchess of Cleveland's box"; while "my Lord Ranelagh, D. Talbot, is [*sic*] in it to the ears." Carlingford and Talbot are "at distance about the agency of the Irish Papists." They went over to England together, however, and agreed to take in the Duchess; but Talbot "did not mean it should be in so superior a power, only to serve and advantage her, not to apply by her, but to depend on the King."

Carlingford, according to these notes, had been somewhat untactful, to say the least, before leaving Ireland. He told the Lord-Lieutenant "strange, unbeseeming things, if the King hears, of [His Majesty] being ever to be governed by another, inconstant, &c." As for the Duchess, he made remarks about her which were certainly more true than polite, on the authority of her daughter—the ten-year-old Anne, afterwards Countess of Sussex! Berkeley was troubled and advised with his secretary what he should do. Leighton* was of opinion that it was best to pass the matter over, as Carlingford would only charge it on him (? Berkeley or Leighton), if taxed with it. Berkeley, however, five days later told Dick Talbot what Carlingford

* Pepys (January 25th, 1665) says that Sir Ellis Leighton was "a mad, freaking fellow . . . and once at Antwerp was really mad." The *Diary*, however, bears testimony to his wit (October 18th, 1664). Carte calls him Buckingham's "own darling favourite." As might be gathered from that, he was notoriously dishonest.

had said, and Talbot, on his arrival in London, spoke of the affair to the Duchess and the King. Leighton, called into Charles's closet, "mixed it and forebore to say the words." We hear of no harm befalling Carlingford in consequence of his indiscretion. In this curious society much plain-speaking was tolerated without resentment. Later we find Talbot, when Duke of Tyrconnel, employing as his chaplain a relative of Carlingford, Mr. Taaffe, "a very honest and discreet clergyman."

The fiasco of the charge against Ormonde before the Privy Council did not keep Talbot out of England long. He appears again at Landguard Fort on May 26th, 1672, on his way to join the combined English and French fleets off the Suffolk coast under the Duke of York. An amusing letter by Sir Charles Lyttelton, then Governor of Landguard, describes his arrival, as well as that of two ladies bound in the same direction. "Yesterday," writes Lyttelton to Williamson, "I had the honour to have Mistress Jennings' and Mistress Willis' company at the Fort, whom, when they had dined, to get rid of I was fain to lend my coach to go part of their way towards the fleet. At night Dick Talbot came, expecting the same riddance, but, that being gone, I was fain to horse him (which, if I had been a greater spark, I should have done them), and he is gone by six this morning."

We can scarcely identify the "Mistress Jennings" here mentioned with Talbot's future sister-in-law,

for Sarah was not yet twelve and was not introduced to the Court for another two years.

The experience of Talbot with the fleet on this occasion was brief and unpleasant. He reached it just in time to take part in the second battle of Southwold (or Sole) Bay, and was one of the sufferers in that fight, though luckier than Lord Sandwich, Sir Fretcheville Hollis and many other high officers. James had in all one hundred and seventy vessels, over a hundred of them warships, with him—"such a gallant and formidable navy never, I think, spread saile upon the seas," says Evelyn—the White squadron being under the French Admiral D'Estrées, the Blue under Sandwich, and the Red under the Duke himself. Standing into Southwold Bay, he took on board the recruits who had come thither to meet him. De Ruyter and the Dutch fleet made their appearance in the early morning of Tuesday, May 29th. The story of the all-but-successful surprise of the allies by the Dutch, and of the fierce struggle, lasting until sunset, is too familiar to need telling again here. The Duke of York was compelled to change his ship twice during the course of the day. With regard to Talbot, our information is derived from a letter by an unknown writer, dated June 1st. Describing the losses in the battle, of which he seems to have received first-hand intelligence, this writer says: "We have lost but one ship, the *James*, which was burnt after having endured the brunt of all the fight; in her was lost the Earl of

Sandwich. The *Catherine* was taken by the Dutch, and in her Sir John Chicheley and Col. Richard Talbot, with several others, who were carried prisoners into other ships; and then the Dutch going to fire her, the rest of the souldiers that were in her saved her and brought her off. . . ."

As in this most stubborn engagement, declared by De Ruyter to be "the hardest fought battle which he ever saw," both parties made captures, it is probable that Talbot was before long exchanged for some Dutch officer, though we do not find a record of his release. The next mentions of him are in the autumn following the battle. On October 16th he is at Chester, on his way to Holyhead, and four days later he reaches Dublin; while at the beginning of November the troop of which he is captain comes to do duty in Dublin. But far more serious matters than the superintendence of his men were awaiting his attention in Ireland. Resentment in England was rising against the leniency shown by the governing cabal towards the Roman Catholics, and it was evident that a reaction was about to take place. Under the Lord-Lieutenancies of Berkeley and the Earl of Essex, who took Berkeley's place in August, 1672, the long-standing rules against the admission of Roman Catholics into the corporations all over Ireland had been relaxed and they had also been accepted as Justices of the Peace. Nine or ten of them, moreover, had been elected to the Common Council of the city of Dublin,

subject to the King's approval, which was soon given. Nor had Talbot refrained from boasting of the intention to "break the Settlement." But he and his friends could not have been unaware of the turning of the tide. Their proceeding at the beginning of 1673 showed that they anticipated difficulties. A considerable sum of money was "collected at the masses throughout Ireland by directions of the priests, Jesuits, and friars, to be disposed of in England for the advantage of the Roman Catholic cause," and with this Talbot and two other colonels, Fitzpatrick and Dempsey, crossed St. George's Channel in March. The disposition of the money was left in the hands of Talbot and Fitzpatrick.*

* Talbot and Fitzpatrick had been enemies, but had become reconciled This is mentioned in a letter from Essex to Ormonde, which is instructive as showing the methods of the Lords-Lieutenant of the period in dealing with the inconveniently large Roman Catholic majority in Ireland. Essex writes: "Soon after my coming hither Moloony, the titular Bp. of Killaloe, whom I look upon as the most dangerous, because the wisest, man of all their clergy, made a composure of all their differences which were amongst the men of their religion, particularly of the disputes which were between their Primate and Peter Talbot, as also the dissentions betwixt Collonel Talbot and Collonel Fitzpatricke, and had upon the matter well near made an union among them all. I soon found if this proceeded I should have no intelligence of any of their practices or acting, and beleeving it to be one of the most important things I could do, both for his Maj^tyes service and the security of his Protestant subjects here, either to keep these men divided, or if they were united to breeke them again, I made use of some of their ffriers, who alwais have their little wrangle with the secular clergy, to set up factions against their Bp. and by encouraging these little annemostys among themselves at length brought them to that pass that they openly accused one another of exercising ecclesiasticall jurisdiction contrary to the laws of the land."

Ormonde himself was no despiser of these methods. One of his letters, quoted by Carte, states: "My aim was to work a division among the Roman clergy, and I believe I had accomplished it, to the great security of the government and the Protestants, and against the opposition of the Pope and his creatures and nuncios, if I had not been removed."

The position of affairs on the arrival of the mission in London was extremely grave. A new wave of hatred against Roman Catholics had been set in motion, chiefly perhaps by the discovery on the Duchess of York's death that she was one and by the very strong suspicion against the Duke also. On March 8th the King had been forced to cancel his year-old Declaration of Indulgence, although it benefited Papists far less than other Dissenters from the Established Church; and on the 20th the Test Act was passed. But apart from this general campaign against Rome, there was a particular attack on the Irish Romanists and on the Talbots by name. On March 26th the House of Commons petitioned the King that for the establishment of the possessions of his subjects in Ireland he would be pleased to maintain the Acts of Settlement and Explanation and to recall his Commission of Enquiry (which had been laboriously engaged for many months in the examination of evidence) as calculated to disturb the peace of the kingdom; and that "Colonel Richard Talbot, who had notoriously assumed to himself the title of agent-general of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, might be immediately dismissed out of all commands, either civil or military, and forbid all access to Court." The petition further demanded that no Papists should be continued or admitted as judges, justices of the peace, sheriffs, mayors, etc., in Ireland; that the titular Popish ecclesiastical authorities, "and in particular

Peter Talbot, pretended Archbishop of Dublin, for his notorious disloyalty and disobedience and contempt of the laws," should be sent abroad; that the regular priests also should be banished and all Roman Catholic convents, schools, etc., be closed; that the permission to live in corporations should be recalled; that all Papists in Ireland should be disarmed; and that "His Majesty should give further directions for the encouragement of the English planters and the Protestant interest in Ireland and the suppression of the insolencies and disorders of the Irish Papists, by whose practices, and particularly of the said Richard and Peter Talbot, the peace and safety of Ireland had been so much of late endangered."

In view of this most comprehensive demand, it is not surprising to learn that Talbot and his colleagues did not attempt to carry things too boldly. "What was the commission of those three colonels from Ireland," writes Sir Arthur Forbes to Viscount Conway, "is not to be learnt here, for at their arrival they found affairs altered from what they expected, and found it convenient to bear a lower sail."

The King, indeed, though he could not reject the peremptory requests of the "Country" party, which headed the attack on the Roman Catholics, did his best to temporise. He answered the petition of the Commons with an assurance that no man should have reason to complain. He dissolved the Commission of

Enquiry and declared that he was resolved to preserve the Settlement of Ireland and to disturb nothing which had been confirmed by the Acts. He appointed, however, another committee from the Privy Council, with far less powers. This new body did, and could do, very little. A small amount was added to the fund for relieving the King's "nominees" specified in the Act of Explanation. Otherwise the injustices which the Roman Catholics suffered through the Settlement remained unredressed for the remainder of Charles's reign. Richard Talbot had been able, previous to 1673, to do some service to his co-religionists —partly by corrupt means, it must be admitted, and not always to the most worthy of them—but for relief on a larger scale he and they had a dozen years more to wait.

Although Peter and Richard Talbot had been so pointedly marked out by the House of Commons petition for punishment, their influence was sufficiently strong, even in the midst of the agitation raging against their religion, to hold their ground for a brief while. The ecclesiastical brother was the earlier to give way, though retreating no farther than to England at first. In one of the numerous letters to Sir Joseph Williamson, while acting as English plenipotentiary at Cologne, Henry Ball, his clerk at the King's Paper Office, gives information about both. "On Tuesday last," writes Ball on June 26th, "landed att Chester Peter Talbott, pretended Archbishop of

Dublin, having been driven out of Ireland by the prosecution of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, as he pretends. The Colonell continues in towne very gallant." This is what we should have expected of the Colonel. He had, moreover, the advantage of the protection of a master who did not forget his servants. In a letter thirteen days earlier Ball, speaking of the Duke of York, tells how "all the reformed Irish Roman Catholiques attend him, among them principally Colonell Talbott." By reformed must be understood removed from their employments; for in no other way had Richard Talbot altered.

To remain in attendance upon the Duke of York, however, would scarcely have been possible, even had James been now popular. It was utterly impossible when not only was Talbot banned by the Test Act and the Commons petition, but also James himself was in a most precarious position and powerless to help others. There was nothing to be done except to leave the country. On a smaller scale the exodus of 1667 was repeated in 1673, but the emigrants were not now all military. A jocular letter to Sir Ralph Verney from Dr. Denton, a kinsman of Frances Jennings, dated September 18th, says: "Peter Talbot, the bishop, desires you to follow him to France. It is thought his brother Dick and Father Patrick will not be long after him." Father Patrick is the priest to whom Evelyn the diarist addressed his long letter of September 27th, 1671, concerning the doctrine of

the Church of England about the Eucharist. He is mentioned several times at this period in conjunction with the younger Talbot; on the last occasion, perhaps, in a letter to Williamson from a correspondent at Whitehall. "The priests and Papists," writes Thomas Ross, "now begin to withdraw, and among others Dick Talbot and Father Patrick (with tears in his eyes) are gone, they and others having provoked many zealous men to bee their enemies, resolving to clamour in Parliament against their stay here contrary to the desire of the Houses." The date of this letter is October 3rd, so that Richard Talbot had withstood for no less than six months the efforts to drive him out of the country.

Talbot crossed over to France, where unfortunately he is lost to view. It would have been interesting to know whether he proceeded to Paris and renewed his acquaintance with Frances, now Lady Hamilton, and her gallant husband. But we hear nothing of his life abroad at this period. The only mention of his name, indeed, is in connection with a house which he owned at Twickenham and which he lent to his sister-in-law Isabella Boynton on her honeymoon. In November, 1674, Isabella, who was one of the maids of honour to the new Duchess of York, married the widower Wentworth Dillon, fourth Earl of Roscommon. The Countess of Burlington, writing to Lady Ormonde, describes how the wedding took place at six o'clock in Sir Allen Apsley's chamber,

"from whence immediately, in the dark, they went to Dick Talbot's at Twittnam."

We cannot ascertain even the length of Richard Talbot's exile now. In March, 1676, his brother Peter returned to England, in spite of the danger threatening all Roman Catholics, and particularly the clergy. But Peter was suffering from a complication of diseases which tamed his restless spirit, and it was no doubt on the plea of ill-health that he obtained permission to come back from France. He retired to Poole Hall, in Cheshire, and lived there for two years in great quiet. As we know from a letter of Richard's, quoted below, that at some period previous to his accusation by Titus Oates in October, 1678, he was residing in "the north of England," we might reasonably have concluded that he shared, for a time at least, Peter's retreat at Poole Hall. But, as a matter of fact, he was in Yorkshire, though in what part is unknown. It is not strange that his movements should be obscure. The violence of the attack on him in Parliament in 1673 made it only prudent that his enemies should hear as little about him as possible. With the reappointment of the generous Ormonde to the Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland it became possible for him to show himself once more in the land of his birth. But persecution soon followed him up there, as the next chapter will relate.

CHAPTER IX

VICTIMS OF TITUS OATES

IT does not come within the scope of this book to attempt a history of the anti-Papist campaign which proceeded through so long a period in the reign of Charles II. and involved so much suffering and so many innocent deaths. Our interest in it is confined to the effect which it had upon the fortunes of Richard Talbot. But from this point of view it is necessary to mention briefly some of the events between Talbot's retirement to France in 1673 and the attack made upon him by Oates five years later.

The Test Act, whose passing preceded by a few days the direct accusation of the Talbot brothers in Parliament, produced one result which its promoters heartily desired; for the Duke of York refused the Test and resigned all his offices, thereby tacitly declaring himself a Roman Catholic. "Squire James," as his enemies now contumeliously nicknamed him, went on

to take to wife the same year "a stiffe Roman Catholique" in the young Princess of Modena, Mary Beatrice of Este, to the openly expressed disgust of the London populace—and the joy, no doubt, of those who hoped to cut him off from succession to the throne. The latter did not yet venture upon an Exclusion Bill, but they brought in measures in both Houses of Parliament which were obviously steps in the direction of such a Bill. A forerunner of Oates had before the end of 1675 stirred the public mind with some truly startling tales of Papist designs. Oates's genius for villainy, however, was not in Luzancy, as he called himself, and he did little real harm beyond revealing to the observant the present applicability of the maxim, *Populus vult decipi, decipiatur.*

The astute King Charles appreciated the position thoroughly. Whatever his own secret religious convictions (if he can be said to have had any), he was annoyed at his brother's untimely honesty. He told the French Ambassador more than once that, if he were to die, he did not believe the Duke could stay eight days in England. He endeavoured to improve the situation by a step which ultimately proved fatal to the unfortunate James; for it cannot be supposed that the Prince of Orange, though next in the succession after the Duke and his family, could ever have made himself master of England, had he not married the Princess Mary.

William had paid his first visit to his uncle's Court

at the end of 1670, when he himself was but nineteen years of age and Mary was a child in the nursery. A round of gaiety marked his stay in England on that occasion. But he was a long-sighted young man, and may even then have tested the ground in front of him. At any rate, there was already a suggestion of his marriage with his cousin. The idea was revived in 1674. But James in the interval had ceased to have any doubts as to his religious duty. Moreover, he recognised the insecurity of his position with regard to the succession, and knew that William had now a definite understanding with the heads of the popular party in England, and that but for the peace of Westminster, which put an end in February to Charles's offensive alliance with France, a Dutch fleet might even have been welcomed to the Thames that spring by a considerable section of the English nation. James could not be expected to look with favour on the prospect of such a son-in-law. But he was compelled to listen to the suggestion. In April, 1674, Edward Coleman, private secretary to the Duchess of York, writes to the Abbé Rizzini, Modena's representative in Paris: "We have had here for some time an envoy from the Prince of Orange, who is to stay in the capacity of Ambassador for Holland, to whom two others will be joined. . . . Our Parliament men are making great plans to concert with these ambassadors, when they arrive, against the French, the Papists, and the Duke himself, in favour of the

States and the Prince of Orange, to whom they have already destined the elder daughter of H.R.H."

It was in vain for James to object. Previously the pro-Dutch party had advocated the match. Now at the end of 1674 Arlington urged it on the King as a means of pacifying his subjects, and Charles eagerly embraced the scheme, sending Arlington and Ossory* over to the Hague to bring it about if possible. William disliked Arlington, suspected a trap, and made out that he was in no condition to take a wife. This piece of rudeness, however, did not put an end to the project. Charles insisted on Mary being confirmed by the Bishop of London, in spite of the protests of James, who hoped, it was said, to marry her to the Dauphin of France; and in 1677, when William came over to England and asked for the Princess's hand, after some fencing he gave his consent to a marriage before the Prince returned to Holland.

Charles's views are set forth in a letter from Barillon, Courtin's successor at the French Embassy, three days before the ceremony took place. "I judge this marriage to be very useful to my interests," said Charles, "and I hope to derive from it very considerable present advantages and still more in the future. The alliance will put an end to the suspicions of my subjects that my connection with France aims at a change of religion. It is the conduct of my brother, the Duke of

* They were brothers-in-law, having married two daughters of a natural son of Maurice, Prince of Orange.

York, which has given rise to all these suspicions. . . . I am assured that the marriage of the Prince of Orange and my niece will dissipate a part of these suspicions and will be of infinite service in showing that I have no design which is not conformable to the laws of England and the established religion. It destroys the possible cabals and engages my nephew in my interests."

Charles little knew his nephew if he believed the statement conveyed in the last few words. But his acquaintance with the real state of the case is suggested by a story told by Dr. Lake, tutor and chaplain to the Princesses Mary and Anne, that the King jestingly urged the Bishop of London to hasten the wedding, lest the Duchess of York should first give birth to a son and spoil all.

Mary became Princess of Orange on November 4th (old style), 1677. Two days later the Duchess bore a male child. "The people of London," writes Barillon, "feel no joy over the birth of the son of the Duke of York, and this has lessened the joy they would have felt over the marriage of the Prince of Orange." But the chagrin of London and of the Prince of Orange was brief. On December 12th the infant Duke of Cambridge died. "This death," Barillon informs Louis next day, "cannot but be of advantage to the Prince of Orange. It raises his future hopes greatly and strengthens his party in England at the present juncture." According to Dr. Lake,

James never showed so much grief over the death of his previous children as now. He dearly desired to have a son and heir. But it is not to be gathered from his *Memoirs* that he yet suspected his son-in-law of actually entertaining base designs against him in respect of the throne.

The designs of others, however, James was soon forced to recognise. In the summer of 1678 Titus Oates made his appearance on the scene and plunged the country into abject terror with his tales. He did not dare to accuse the Duke directly of implication in the Popish plot. But in the wretched Coleman, secretary to Mary Beatrice, he pitched upon an intriguer who was really guilty of negotiations with French ambassadors and agents, and ecclesiastics in both France and Italy, which could not be satisfactorily explained. Coleman, a Suffolk clergyman's son and a convert to Rome, professed great devotion to Roman Catholicism and the interests of France, and had thus obtained large sums of money for his own use. In a less excited state of the country the fact that he had enriched himself might have induced people to think less seriously of his political and religious schemes. But now the very existence of such schemes, even in the mind of so insignificant a person as Coleman, was sufficient to cause an explosion of popular madness. Coleman was a victim made for the hands of Oates. In his ruin he dragged down the Duke. James had already dismissed him from his wife's household by

the King's command. But this did not save him when genuine papers of Coleman's were produced amid the forgeries of Oates and his associates. Coleman was executed, the least worthy to be pitied of the sufferers through the scare. Against the Duke an address was presented by both Houses of Parliament, calling for his banishment from the presence and councils of the King. A partial concession failed to satisfy his virulent enemies, and at last James, having insisted on a formal order from his brother to leave the kingdom, sailed for the Hague on his way to Brussels on March 4th, 1679.

It is unnecessary to refer to the other achievements of Titus Oates beyond his statement to the House of Commons on October 23rd, 1678. Here he gave a list of those to whom the Pope had, through patents given to Father D'Oliva, General of the Jesuits, committed all the chief posts in England and Ireland after the murder of the King and the upset of the government should have been effected. In England Lord Arundel of Wardour was to be Chancellor, Lord Powis Treasurer, Lord Bellasyse Commander-in-Chief, Lord Petre Lieutenant-General, Sir William Godolphin Privy Seal, etc. In Ireland Peter Talbot was to be Chancellor, Richard Talbot Commander-in-Chief, Lord Mountgarret Lieutenant-General, etc. At this time Oates had only to speak to be believed. Of the alleged Papal nominees in England Arundel, Powis, Petre and Bellasyse were secured at once, together with the aged William Howard, Viscount Stafford; and orders were

sent over to Ireland for the arrest of Richard Talbot, Mountgarret and others, Peter Talbot being already in custody.

We have seen that not only the Archbishop of Dublin but his brother also were living in the North of England for some time between 1676 and 1678. Both were anxious to return to Ireland—which is not to be wondered at, seeing the conditions under which they were existing in England. Their opportunity came when Lord Essex ceased to be viceroy and Ormonde took his place. In April, 1677, King Charles suddenly abandoned his attitude of coldness towards his faithful servant, invited himself to supper with him, and told him that he designed to make him Lord-Lieutenant once more. In August he was back in Dublin Castle. How soon Richard Talbot followed him does not appear in the pages of Carte, but he gives the circumstances of Peter's return. The elder Talbot was seriously ill with stone and other complaints at Poole Hall, and, thinking his end near at hand, wished to die in Ireland. He therefore made interest through his brother Dick to the Duke of York to recommend him to Ormonde and "prevail for a connivance at his return if he behaved quietly and meddled in no affairs." On this understanding he was allowed to come back in May, 1678, being carried in a chair to Colonel Talbot's house at Lutterell's Town, from which he never stirred again until his arrest five months later.

There is little doubt that Richard had preceded his brother. In March his wife Katherine died, being buried at Christchurch Cathedral, Dublin, on the 17th. There could have been no difficulty for the husband to procure leave from Ormonde to return to Lutterell's Town to attend his wife's death-bed, if indeed he was not allowed back before.

In May, therefore, we may imagine Richard Talbot at his home outside Dublin in the company of his invalid brother and of two young daughters left to him by his wife, the elder named after her Katherine, the younger Charlotte. There is no evidence of his activity in Irish affairs now, but that he was not debarred from appearing at the Castle we shall soon see.

The tentacles of the monster Oates extended over to Ireland in October, 1678, and the first to be seized by them was Peter Talbot. Some letters written by him whilst in exile in Paris were found among Coleman's papers. This alone was a sufficient excuse for arresting him; but in addition there were enemies in Dublin ready to come forward with accusations against him. His bodily condition was no protection to him. In the eyes of fanatics there was nothing absurd in the idea that a man dying of stone should be plotting treason, murder, and self-aggrandisement. A curious document forwarded to Ormonde by an agent signing himself simply "W." and preserved among the Ormonde manuscripts, has a story about Peter Talbot which must apparently be referred to the period

preceding his arrest. According to this, the Irish were telling their friends that "most woeful bloody times were at hand"—that is to say, for the Protestants of the country. Now an Irish gentleman (who is not named) fell out with Peter Talbot, and thereupon told "a Protestant person of quality" that he could prove Talbot a traitor if he were taken to the Chancellor. This was done, and the Chancellor asked for the accusation to be committed to writing. The Irish gentleman wrote it out and delivered it to "the person of honour" to be given to the Chancellor. "In twenty-four hours the party told the person of honour that he had undone him, for Talbot had the papers."

The anti-Papists were so reckless in their assertions that they did not hesitate at the same time to charge the Dublin Castle officials with undue friendship for the Roman Catholics and the latter with horrid plots against Dublin Castle. Ormonde's position was made very difficult for him, but he did not lose his presence of mind. He was away from the Irish capital when he received the order, dated September 30th, for the apprehension of Peter Talbot. He at once made out a warrant and prepared to return to Dublin. What he thought of the allegation that the Archbishop was scheming against his life is only to be gathered from a letter written by him to Sir Robert Southwell on October 10th, as he was starting back to the Castle. Southwell would know from Dublin,

he said, whether Peter Talbot was taken on the previous day at his brother's house; "for there he has openly lived ever since the Colonel last kept house here, and thence (it is at least pretended) he could not suffer to be removed by any ordinary means of travelling by reason of his great pains." Referring to the alleged plot, and the designs attributed to Peter against himself, Ormonde continues: "I do not think my life of consideration enough to be mentioned or taken care of when the King is threatened, yet I may say Peter Talbot has undertaken or has been assigned much the least wicked part of the tragedy, and that this is not the first time he has been said to have encouraged the acting of it."

Ormonde was at Dublin on the 11th to preside over a meeting of the Privy Council called to consider the best measures for the public safety. The warrant against Peter Talbot had not been executed immediately, for the officer sent to arrest him at Lutterell's Town found him in so weak a state that he had contented himself with taking Richard's security for his appearance. His papers had been seized, but nothing was found among them except a few letters on controversial points of divinity.* On the 11th, however,

* "I did not expect," writes Ormonde to Southwell, "there would have been any papers of moment found with him, because I did not doubt but he would have intelligence of the informations given against him as soon as I, at least time enough to dispose of any he had no mind should be found with him." In another letter to Southwell Ormonde shows a certain amount of indignation at the (certainly unwarranted) charge that he was too friendly disposed toward the Archbishop. "Those that have been informed of Peter

he was carried in a chair from Lutterell's Town to the Castle and confined. Carte, who speaks of "his miserable, helpless condition, the violence of his distemper being scarce supportable and threatening his death every moment," relates that he was allowed to have an attendant to wait upon him in prison.

Richard Talbot was left at liberty a month longer than his brother. In fact, he seems to have ventured to move from Lutterell's Town to a house in Dublin and (if what Ormonde's critics said was true) to have interviews with the Lord-Lieutenant concerning the state of affairs. This was bold conduct on the part of both, in view of the scare caused in Ireland by the stories coming over from England* and of the demands for Talbot's arrest. In a letter which he wrote to Southwell on November 6th, Ormonde says: "I can

Talbot's publicly appearing here," he says, "and would attribute it to my indulgence towards him, are ill-informed themselves or maliciously conceal the well-known distance I have kept myself at from that busy, hot-headed man, whom the very Jesuits themselves thought too busy for their Society; nor do the informers remember how publicly in the time of a former governor he did the honours of his brother's house at feasts and entertainments, his constitution then being able to undergo the fatigue, nor yet that upon some controversy he appeared at the Council Board, being known to be titular Archbishop of Dublin, and yet was suffered to return to the place from whence he came; which I do not say to reflect on any of my predecessors."

* Carte relates that letters were dropped in the streets of Dublin pretending to betray an assassination plot against the Lord-Lieutenant. Probably they were intended to make him more energetic in his execution of the new proclamations against the Roman Catholics. But Ormonde declined to be frightened and did his best to reassure the settlers, many of whom were no doubt genuinely alarmed by the current rumours. For these settlers, vastly outnumbered by Roman Catholics, there was at least an excuse which did not exist for Oates's dupes in England.

assure you that the real or pretended fears of some considerable men have put the common sort of English and Protestants almost out of their wits, especially in Munster, from whence the terror is diffused through the whole Kingdom, to the greatest disheartening of the English and the encouragement of the disaffected Irish; than which I take nothing to be more dangerous or like to draw what we apprehend upon us." He adds: "I have given my son Ossory the reasons why I have not secured my Lord Mountgarret and Colonel Talbot, the same evidence being said to be against them that sent five lords to the Tower."

Ormonde, however, in the course of a few days had no option but to seize Talbot. On the 12th he received an order from the Secretary of State for the immediate apprehension of him, of Richard Butler (Mountgarret's eldest son), and of John Pippard, all on account of the commissions stated by Oates to have been given them by the Pope. Old Lord Mountgarret himself, being ill, was left in peace, his son taking his place.

Pippard, to whom Oates had assigned the post of Colonel in Ireland under the revolutionary government, had already absconded and could not be found. The other two were arrested without difficulty. Talbot was at the Castle itself on the day that the order arrived. Ormonde writes to Lord Conway: "I received this morning directions from the King for the securing of Colonel Richard Talbot, who was then walking in the gallery, and, I believe, expected with

every post to be so treated. I immediately gave the Deputy Constable of the Castle order to take him into his custody, where he now is."

Thus both Peter and Richard were now lodged in prison on charges of which one was certainly, the other probably, innocent. Both made efforts to secure their release. The tortured Archbishop appealed through his family, particularly through his nephew Sir William, who appears to have possessed the solid merits of his father rather than the more volatile talents of some of his uncles*; but in vain. The fact of his having corresponded with Coleman was no doubt fatal; and Ormonde's "great kindness" for the Talbot family, of which he himself writes to his son Arran a little later, did not extend to Peter. He was willing, on the other hand, to assist Richard, in spite of their past quarrels. The Colonel's petition was based on the ill effects which his confinement had upon his health. He had already commenced to put on that weight which was to trouble him so much as he grew older. This we know from Marvel's ferocious picture of him in *Advice to a Painter:*

> "Next Talbot must by his great Master stand,
> Laden with Folly, Flesh, and ill-got Land:
> He's of a size indeed to fill a Porch,
> But ne'er can make a Pillar of the Church;
> His Sword is all his Arg'ment, not his Book,
> Altho' no Scholar, he can act the Cook;
> And will cut Throats again, if he be paid;
> In th' Irish Shambles he first learn'd the Trade."

* James appointed him to look after his large Irish estates, and after his accession made him Master of the Rolls in Ireland.

It was just eight months before Richard Talbot obtained his release. On June 21st, 1679, Southwell, in London, wrote over to Ormonde in Dublin: "On a petition yesterday from Colonel Talbot to go to his house upon bail, by reason of his sickness in prison, there was a long debate, and it was finally agreed that he should, upon ten thousand pounds bail, be allowed to come over and live in Yorkshire, where he lived before. Some thought he would rather choose to stay in prison than to come over on this side, and most were against his being free on that, which yet his agent does much struggle for, especially till his health be restored; and how the order will settle at last I know not, but it will not go till Tuesday."

A few more weeks passed before the desired order could be procured. Another communication to Ormonde, sent by the Earl of Anglesey on July 12th, shows the final steps. "I received your last letter," says Anglesey, "with the enclosed certificate of Dr. Meara, which came seasonably to help me in obtaining His Majesty's and Council's order for Col. Talbot's liberty and their license for his going into France for cure, both which Your Grace will receive by this post."

The younger Talbot was free again, under conditions, and prepared to depart from home. Not even now, however, in the midst of his troubles, did he refrain from a little business in Irish land, acting apparently on behalf of the Duke and Duchess of York. Lord

From an engraving by H. Robinson, after the painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller in Lord Strathmore's collection.

JAMES BUTLER, DUKE OF ORMOND.

Granard writes to Lord Conway from Dublin, telling him how, "as Col. Richard Talbot was parting from hence, he entertained me with several discourses too tedious to relate at this distance, amongst others of that affair of Holywood's"—the question being about the reversion of an estate which was desired by both the Duchess and by Granard.

Talbot left Ireland, probably in August, and made his way to Paris. Soon reports came back which considerably embarrassed Ormonde, already much censured by his enemies for the part which he had taken in the Colonel's release. On November 2nd Henry Coventry writes to him from Whitehall that "it is said Col. Talbot is as well at Paris as ever in his life," in consequence of which reflections have been cast on the attestations of the Irish doctors as to the state of his health. Everything, indeed, was seized upon which could be twisted to support the contention that Ormonde was "popishly inclined." Happily, however, at this season King Charles stood by his old minister loyally, replying to the attacks made on him in the English House of Lords with the statement that he had one of his kingdoms in good hands and was resolved to keep it so; while, when Essex (who would have liked to be Lord-Lieutenant again) asked him if the report was true that he meant to remove Ormonde from Dublin, Charles roundly denounced it as "a damned lie."

As we know, nothing could have been further from

the truth than the charge that Ormonde wished to favour the Roman Catholics. But he was that great rarity of the period, a tolerant man. Only in one case do we find him countenancing persecution, and there he could scarcely have ventured to show himself lenient. The wretched Peter Talbot lingered on in his prison until about the end of October, 1680, when he succumbed at last to his diseases. Confined in a cell near him was Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh, the rival with whom he had disputed so bitterly over the titular primacy of Ireland. A touching incident was that shortly before his death Talbot received absolution at the hands of Plunket, next year destined to die on the scaffold, the last of the innocents sacrificed to that horrible incarnation of religious ferocity, Titus Oates.

As we are before long to see Richard Talbot in the part of leader of his co-religionists during their brief season of ascendancy, it is well to remember what grievances he cherished from the years 1679–80. He was, no doubt, luckier than a great number of others who had given far less cause for offence than he. But even eight months in jail on a baseless charge cannot be expected to make a good impression on the sufferer's mind. And his brother, for whom we have no reason to suppose that his friendship was other than genuine, was certainly condemned to an agonizing death chiefly on account of the religious views which they both shared. Yet we shall not find " the Popish Champion," as he was to be nicknamed one day, becoming in his turn

a bloodthirsty persecutor. The trade which Marvel delicately suggests that Talbot learned in "th' Irish Shambles" was not exercised at the expense of those whom he had excellent reason to hate. He had, in fact, no inclination toward butchery, which is more than can be said of many with whom he came in conflict at different periods of his career.

PART IV

TEN YEARS TOGETHER

CHAPTER I

THE MARRIAGE OF RICHARD AND FRANCES

RICHARD TALBOT arrived in France at a period when the relations between that country and England were at their worst point since Charles II. returned to Whitehall. As early as 1677 Barillon had been told, on taking up his appointment as Ambassador, that his master had no real friends in England except the King and the Duke of York. In the following spring even the Duke appeared reconciled to the idea of a quarrel with France as the readiest means of lessening the prevailing animosity against himself. The Peace of Nimeguen was followed by the breaking of one bond of union between the two countries, when the British auxiliaries in Louis's army were compulsorily disbanded. The violence of the anti-Papist feeling in England made it very difficult for even so astute a diplomatist as Barillon, prompt alike with promises and with cash, to check the general antipathy here to the leading Roman Catholic Power. Bribery, as

employed by Barillon, did its work well, but it could only prevent war, not promote international cordiality. The effect of the attitude of England soon made itself felt in France. Louis himself was displeased with the poor return for his vast outlay of money, while great bitterness was aroused in his Roman Catholic subjects over the persecution of their co-religionists across the Channel. Savile writes home on one occasion of the threats current in Paris of retaliation upon the French Protestants (already turned out of all their employments) if the five lords in the Tower should come to any harm.

What Talbot proposed to himself to do in Paris, or what he actually did on his arrival, we do not hear. He was a comparatively rich man, as is shown by his being able to find the £10,000 bail demanded of him before his release in Dublin, and was not compelled to look for employment to maintain himself. But he was of too active a disposition to become an idler. All that we know for certain of his proceedings is that he met again his first love, Frances Jennings, now Countess of Bantry, and married her. But the marriage appears not to have taken place till late in 1681.* If this is correct, he was a widower of fifty-one, she a widow of about thirty-three, when at last they decided to join their fortunes. Her circumstances can scarcely have improved since the time of her first husband's death; for her daughters were growing up—Elizabeth was

* See note on page 634.

already fourteen—and costing more to keep. It is true her brother Ralph, when he died in 1677, left Sandridge between her and her two sisters; and that Barbara's death in the following year made her and Sarah joint owners. But her share in the manor cannot have gone far toward relieving her necessities. Of her late husband's family, the Comtesse de Gramont was as much in favour at Versailles as formerly at Whitehall, and may have been able to help her; the brothers Anthony and Richard quitted the French service after Nimeguen and are said to have returned home.

From the pecuniary point of view Talbot's second marriage, therefore, seems to have been no more brilliant than his first. But again he married beauty; and Frances was certainly a woman of distinction, who, but for her change of faith, might have been shining at the Court of Whitehall once more. So it is strange that the fact of his taking her to wife is not recorded in any contemporary letters known to us. The only references which can be discovered to Richard Talbot at this point in his life are in connection with some plot which Viscount Preston imagined himself to have unearthed in Paris in 1682. Preston that year succeeded Henry Savile as Ambassador to France, and on August 12th began writing to Sir Leoline Jenkins, Secretary of State, concerning his discovery. The arch-plotter he believed to be an Irish priest named Gleson, "a very extraordinary rogue," who had been chaplain to Sir George Hamilton's regiment and after-

wards to Colonel MacCarty,* Hamilton's successor. "I find he is very well known here," says Preston, in one letter; "he hath been concerned in business of Sir G. Hamilton's since his death, and that he, upon that account, hath had occasion to address to my Lady who is now married to Coll. Talbot." Gleson, it is suggested, had made use of his acquaintance with the former Lady Hamilton to approach her second husband in the matter of a rising in Ireland, provided that Louis could be induced to consent to send a French fleet over to assist. Gleson, according to Preston's information, so far succeeded with Talbot that on October 24th they went to Louis and submitted "eleven propositions" to him.

The Ambassador was told of these extraordinary schemes by a certain Captain Shelton, *alias* Roger Tilley, an Irishman by birth, who, after being page to the Earl of Denbigh, had entered the French service, risen to a captaincy of horse, and retired with a little money. Preston was anxious later to minimise the amount of belief which he put in Shelton's revelations, but it is clear from his correspondence that at first he was inclined to accept them as true. The English government received his intelligence cautiously from the beginning, only directing him to prosecute his enquiries into the matter. King Charles's commonsense, and his weariness of the very name of a plot, made such tales as this of Shelton's most unwelcome

* *i.e.*, Justin MacCarty, younger brother of Talbot's one-time opponent.

to him. Still, he was persuaded to grant the informer an interview if he should come over to England. This Shelton did, and on February 17th, 1683, he was introduced to the King at Whitehall. Sir Leoline Jenkins writes a long letter to Preston describing the interview and its result. After he had told his story, Shelton was conjured to confess what his motive was—which, perhaps, was scarcely the treatment he expected. But he did not break down. "He persisting confidently in his affirmations," says Jenkins, "was bid to withdraw for some time, and being called in again, and still persisting in his assertions, my Lord Keeper told him it was His Majesty's pleasure that he should out of hand get him gone out of his presence and of the kingdom too, His Majesty looking upon him as a dangerous lyer and a great fourbe."

Charles's estimate of the value of Shelton's revelations was no doubt correct. It appears from a document among the Ormonde manuscripts that the man had made an attempt to pass them off on someone else before he found a victim in Lord Preston. On March 6th, 1682, Arran, then Lord Deputy of Ireland, had before him in Dublin the Deans of St. Patrick's and Kilkenny, and examined them in connection with a supposed plot. They informed him that they had on the previous October 10th, in France, had a conversation with an Irishman named "Captain Tille, *alias* Shelton," who told them of the French King's designs on England and of the intention to make

Richard Talbot Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. No more is heard of this in Ireland, but no doubt the statement of the two Deans was ready for Jenkins to refer to when Preston's letter of August 12th reached him.

There is thus no reason for supposing that Talbot allowed himself to swerve aside now from his lifelong loyalty to join in a crack-brained scheme for raising a revolt in Ireland with the assumed aid of a French fleet. If there was one point noticeable above all others in the behaviour of the Irish Roman Catholic leaders during the reign of Charles II., it is that they discountenanced risings. The plots and mutinies were all among the settlers and the soldiery, who, of course, included no Roman Catholics. Irresponsible adventurers in exile there may have been—perhaps the "extraordinary rogue" Gleson was one—who cherished ideas of some violent remedy for the ills of the oppressed Irish. But Talbot was no fool. His bitterest enemies do not accuse him of that. He had set himself to work by other and less clumsy means than the sword. And the time was approaching when he felt he could take up the work again.

It was in February, 1683, that Talbot determined to make an effort to put an end to his exile. The greatly improved state of affairs for the Roman Catholics in general, and the Duke of York in particular, since Charles's abrupt dissolution of Parliament at Oxford no doubt encouraged him. He appealed

once more to Ormonde for help, and his letter is interesting in many ways. Incidentally it throws some light on his financial position, and is fairly conclusive proof (if any be wanted) that he had been engaged in no traitorous schemes in Paris.

"I am confident," writes Talbot, "if your Grace had believed me guilty of so much as a thought against His Majesty's service, you had not so generously appealed for my liberty when I was a prisoner in the Castle of Dublin, and I hope that the same reason will now prevail with you to move the King that I may return to put some order to my small affairs, that extremely suffer by my absence for now almost four years from home. My Lord, should I be obliged to live here any longer time, I must certainly be ruined, the expense of this place being excessive for any man that must live as I, and that has so numerous a family. And though His Majesty shall be pleased to approve of my return to my own house, I do assure your Grace I shall need be a good husband to pay the debts I have contracted since I had the misfortune to be named in the Plot, and that your Grace may the more freely move His Majesty to grant this my most humble request, pray be pleased to know that I am none of those persons that are impeached by the House of Commons, and that all that ever was laid to my charge was a story of Mr. Oates that he had seen some commission which was sent me into

Ireland, and at the same time he said it was sent me into Ireland I lived in the north of England and did not come thither in six months after, all which is but a bare hearsay and cannot so much as bear any action at common law."

In conclusion, Talbot asks merely to be allowed to settle his affairs at home and then to withdraw to any corner of the world where the King may command him—though he would willingly enjoy himself in Ireland under Ormonde's "happy government," having observed that only under it have those who have served the King met with any good treatment.

From Carte's narrative of the circumstances attending Ormonde's removal from the Lord-Lieutenancy in Ireland in 1684, it would naturally be gathered that the finish of the above letter was entirely insincere, and that Talbot behaved with base ingratitude towards one who now at his request did him a great service. This is a point which may be left to the next chapter. Here it may be recorded that Ormonde duly and successfully commended Talbot's case to the King, for which he obtained his thanks; and that Talbot proceeded to Ireland, accompanied by his wife and their joint families.

So little is ascertainable about the purely domestic life of Richard and Frances Talbot that we can conveniently sum up the probable facts here in a single paragraph. The "so numerous a family" of which Talbot wrote to Ormonde consisted of his daughters

Katherine and Charlotte; of his wife's daughters, Elizabeth, Frances, and Mary Hamilton; and, perhaps, of one other daughter, the child of them both, who first saw the light during their stay in Paris. On June 17th in the year following their arrival in Dublin, Katherine Talbot died, being buried in the same grave as her mother at Christchurch Cathedral. Another child, the infant offspring of Richard and Frances, whether born in Paris or in Dublin, also died within a month, and was buried at the Cathedral. Several more children were born to the Talbots in Dublin, but none of them seem to have reached maturity. Alone of their family proper one girl, possibly the eldest, is said to have grown up with her four half-sisters, married, and left descendants. We shall have occasion to mention all five again before the end of this book.

CHAPTER II

THE LIFTING OF THE CLOUD

IN the reaction against persecution of the Papists which marked the closing period of Charles's reign, Richard Talbot came quickly to the front. His master, the Duke of York, having weathered the storms during which he was threatened with total exclusion from the throne, or at the best with nominal rule under the protectorate of the Prince and Princess of Orange, had regained much of his former influence. He was restored to the Admiralty and to the Privy Council; not without rousing protests, it is true, but without effective opposition. A token of the changed condition of affairs was the attention paid by the Prince of Orange to the Duke of Monmouth. William's own chances of supplanting his uncle and father-in-law had, temporarily at least, declined so much that he thought it advisable to cultivate the friendship of one who had taken his place as the hope of the extreme Protestants.

James's restoration to power was, of course, to Talbot's advantage; for his favour to his Gentleman of the Bedchamber remained constant. It is not certain, however, whether Talbot's first employment in Ireland after his arrival was in connection with an official mission or was voluntary. Probably he was acting under directions from England, but had no definite post. In either case he was working in sympathy with the views of the King and the Duke of York, and his labours proved of great assistance to them. A plan was maturing for extensive changes in the government of Ireland, both civil and military, and Charles knew that they could not be carried out while Ormonde was at Dublin Castle.* A more pliable chief governor was in view in the person of Lawrence Hyde, whose merits his brother-in-law the Duke of York extolled highly. The difficulty was to find an excuse for removing Ormonde. Charles had a genuine liking for him, and, faithless in friendship as he is usually esteemed to be, was anxious to lessen the shock of his dismissal as much as possible. He had recently treated him with high honour, sending for him to England in 1682, to assist him in council, making him a Duke in the English peerage in the following year,

* Carte says: "It was intended to make a general alteration in all employments, which it was thought the Duke of Ormonde would not approve and was therefore improper to be put under his direction. This is the very reason assigned by the King for his removal, and the changes proposed [such as putting Roman Catholics into army commands] were so contrary to His Grace's sentiments that he was very glad to be discharged from the employment." (*Ormond*, IV., 672-3.)

and not allowing him to return to Dublin until 1684. Carte says that the order given to him in the June of 1684 to prepare for his return was sudden and unexpected; and he shows that Ormonde suspected nothing as yet. Owing to his wife's illness and her death in July he did not set out for Ireland until August. Carte now gives the following account, from which it appears that Talbot had already quitted Ireland for London:

"His Grace was attacked as soon as ever he had left London, upon suggestions from Colonel Talbot, who had been in Ireland a little before, and made such a report to His Majesty that a general reformation in the council, magistracy and army of that kingdom was intended. The Lord-Lieutenant had so little thought thereof that in the way from Aylesbury to Warwick, whither Sir R. Southwell accompanied him, he was observing to him that he had left but few enemies behind him; , . . that Colonel Talbot had returned him thanks for concurring to his coming over from Paris, where he had remained from the time of the Popish plot; and that His Majesty had only muttered, and that slightly, in relation to some defects about false musters which he had heard of in the army, and somewhat in regard of the stores. Notwithstanding this, Sir Robert, returning to London, did before the end of that very month send him certain advertisement of his removal. His Grace, returning to him an answer on September 5th, uses this expression

in his letter: 'They begin very early that, before I am warm in my post here or my head settled from the agitation of the sea, find objections to my conduct.'"

In Carte's opinion, the chief point against Ormonde was that there were some disaffected persons among the army officers and the justices of the peace—"an inconvenience," he comments, "scarce possible to be avoided as long as such persons are guarded in speaking their sentiments and wary in their conduct." But there was more the matter than that. As we have said, extensive changes were planned in Ireland. Under Berkeley's brief rule at the Castle and during the early part of Essex's term of office a taste had been given of what was contemplated. Although the indulgences then granted were mere matters of justice, they were withdrawn very quickly after the address of the English House of Commons in 1673, and replaced by strict enforcement of the penal laws. With Ormonde once more Lord-Lieutenant, there was a slight relaxation of severity until the mad fury of the Popish Plot days forced even the tolerant Ormonde to countenance such brutalities as the treatment of the dying Peter Talbot. His brother Richard's return to Ireland was a sign of the better times prevailing there for Roman Catholics. But the latter, after all they had suffered, were looking for something more than the mild administration of harsh and unjust laws. Of all that they had striven for since the

beginning of the actual reign of Charles II. in England, very little had yet been secured beyond restorations to property which left the Roman Catholic majority with about two millions and a half out of eleven million acres of surveyed land in Ireland. Compared with what was demanded, for instance, by Richard Talbot before the Privy Council in 1671, this was indeed a small gain. When, however, the Duke of York was again in enjoyment of his old posts, and no longer under the threat of exclusion from the throne, when the ultra-Protestants lay crushed by the ruin of their leaders, the opportunity seemed to have come for seeking further advantages.

The choice of Richard Talbot to report on the steps needful for the "reformation" of Ireland was natural, seeing that it was now twenty years since he had first stood forward as the champion of his co-religionists there. Carte implies that he was ungrateful to Ormonde in reporting as he did; and it cannot be doubted that his report was used as a weapon against the Lord-Lieutenant. But Talbot was working for a cause which he had always at heart; and, apart from the question of the rightness or wrongness of that cause, can we hold that he should have refrained now from advancing it because to do so involved loss of office to a man who had done him many kindnesses? We must admit that Talbot's behaviour to Ormonde in the past had been open to grave censure. On the present occasion he was in a dilemma, and elected—as probably all other

men would have done with a cause at heart—to regard political and religious principles rather than personal friendship. There is no evidence, however, that he made a personal attack on Ormonde now. He called for changes in the Privy Council, the magistracy and the army of Ireland. As a Roman Catholic he could scarcely do less, Council, bench and army being Protestant monopolies. And if there were abuses unconnected with religion to which he drew attention, by pointing them out he did not necessarily reflect on Ormonde. When the latter was absent in England from April, 1682, to August, 1684, he left as his Deputy at Dublin his son Arran—Ossory having died two years previously. Arran was no such fine cavalier as his elder brother. During his deputyship he was at least accused of keeping low company and degrading the dignity of his office. If there was any justice in such a charge, it would not be surprising that the civil and military administration of Ireland should have suffered.

Ormonde was only left for two months at Dublin before he was informed of the intention to recall him. He received notice from the King in October, together with an intimation that the Earl of Rochester, the former Lawrence Hyde, would succeed him "as the fittest person on many accounts, and particularly because his near relation* to the Duke of Ormonde would engage him to make the concerns of His Grace

* Ormonde's grandson, afterwards the second Duke, had married Anne Hyde, daughter of Rochester.

and his family his own and to take that care thereof which His Majesty desired might always be continued." No precise date was fixed for his return, beyond that it was to take place when convenient to him in the following spring. Rochester, as a matter of fact, was not so anxious to go to Ireland as the King and the Duke were to send him. The success of the cabals against both Robarts and Ormonde during their absence from Whitehall warned him what might be his own fate. The comfortable post of Lord President of the Council, to which he had recently been elevated in succession to the Earl of Radnor (previously Lord Robarts), was more to his taste than Dublin Castle. As it was possible at the same time to make Ormonde's dismissal less abrupt and to meet Rochester's wish for delay, it thus came about that Ormonde was still acting as Lord-Lieutenant when King Charles died.

On February 11th, 1685, Ormonde proclaimed James II. King, almost his last official act in Dublin. Already he had been warned to be ready to start, and now a definite order for his recall was received, together with a commission to two Lords Justices to administer Ireland until his successor should arrive. "It seems," says Carte, "the favourites of the new King were in great haste to publish to all that the Duke of Ormonde was not in His Majesty's good graces."

The Duke resigned his powers into the hands of the Lords Justices and departed for Holyhead and London. On the road to town he met in a newsletter the earliest

tidings that his regiment of horse in Ireland had been taken from him and given to Colonel Talbot. The first steps had been made towards the new order of things, and already people were set talking of what was to follow. At the end of the entry in his diary for March, 1685, Narcissus Luttrell says: "The Duke of Ormonde, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, is removed from that government, and two lords justices appointed for that purpose at present; his regiment is given to Col. Talbot: the privy council is dissolved and a new one appointed, and some talk as if there were a design for the papists regaineing their estates in that kingdom." Barillon also bears witness to the effect produced by Talbot's advancement. Writing to Louis on April 20th/30th, he tells him: "The zealous Protestants already say loudly that this Prince has departed from what he said to the Council and what is implied in his published declaration, having formally promised to do nothing against the Protestant religion, although he has since given a regiment in Ireland to Colonel Talbot, which is, they say, to advance Popery and to begin to destroy the Protestant religion."

The protagonist for so many years of the Irish Roman Catholics could not expect to escape the public eye, now that the King upon the throne was his friend and master and the sharer of his religious convictions. It is not surprising, therefore, that his appointment, even to the head of a regiment, should give rise to rumours. And the rumours, as we know, were

destined to prove correct. At the beginning of James's reign, however, wise counsels prevailed. Deep-scheming traitors and hot-headed fanatics, working in combination, were not yet driving the King on at a furious pace toward the abyss. Even in Roman Catholic Ireland no undue haste was made; affairs in the kingdom generally proceeded in much the same way as during the most peaceful years of Charles II. The Lords Justices were Michael Boyle, Archbishop of Armagh, and Lord Granard; and if Ormonde's Privy Council was reduced in number the vacancies were not yet filled with Roman Catholics.

Talbot is supposed to have gone back to Ireland as soon as James ascended the throne; but the date of his crossing does not appear, nor whether he was accompanied by his wife and family. As we do not hear of Frances and the girls returning with him from Dublin in the following January, it seems probable that they were all left behind in London, except Frances's eldest daughter, Elizabeth Hamilton, who was still in Paris.

Frances herself was in attendance upon the Queen at the Coronation in Westminster Abbey on April 23rd, 1685, appearing in the records as the Countess of Bantry; and in the earliest lists of Queen Mary's household she figures as a Lady of the Bedchamber in the company of her sister Lady Roscommon, the Duchess of Norfolk, Lady Sophia Bulkeley and Lady Bellasyse, at a salary of £500 a year each.

Talbot's precise status in Ireland during the ten months between James's accession and Clarendon's arrival in Dublin is nowhere defined. He was put in command, as we have heard, of the troop of horse formerly belonging to Ormonde. He seems to have received no commission yet as general over the Irish army. When, however, the unhappy Monmouth's rebellion showed up the untrustworthiness of the militia in the West of England and the King decided to disarm and disband that force everywhere, it was to Talbot that the duty was entrusted of carrying out the process in Ireland. Lord Macaulay says that James's order for disarmament was interpreted by Talbot against the colonists only. As they alone were admitted to the militia, Talbot exercised no discrimination against them when he disarmed them. The nervous settlers put a bad interpretation upon the proceeding; but, after all, there was still a regular army of seven thousand men in Ireland, hostile in faith to the Roman Catholic majority.

When Talbot had been a few months in Ireland James bestowed upon him the first signal mark of his long-continued esteem. On June 20th he elevated him to the peerage of Ireland under the titles of Baron of Talbotstown, Viscount Baltinglas, and Earl of Tyrconnel. In the preamble to the patent mention is made of Talbot's "immaculate allegiance and infinitely great services performed to the King, and to King Charles II., in England, Ireland and foreign

parts, both by sea and land, in which he suffered frequent imprisonments and many grievous wounds." In default of a son born to him by his wife, the remainder was, firstly, to his nephew, Sir William Talbot, Baronet, and his heirs male; and, secondly, to another nephew, William Talbot of Haggardstown, son of his brother Garrett.

The newly-created Earl was no doubt assured that this honour was but a foretaste of what was in store for him. But he was forced to realise very soon that what he hoped for in Ireland would not come about for some time. When the vacant Lord-Lieutenancy had to be filled up, James did not venture to appoint a Roman Catholic yet. For six months after he ascended the throne he kept the post open. He had made his two brothers-in-law, Clarendon and Rochester, Lord Privy Seal and Lord Treasurer respectively. Rochester, as we have seen, had been designed by King Charles for Ireland, but now James nominated the elder brother. The news reached Dublin before the end of August, for on the 29th of that month Tyrconnel wrote to the King that "Clarendon's nomination as governor of Ireland terrifies the Catholics."

Henry, second Earl of Clarendon, was indeed a mild scarecrow to terrify anybody. But Tyrconnel's statement is easy to understand. The Irish had been hoping for wonderful changes under a Roman Catholic king. The delay in filling up the Lord-Lieutenancy caused them considerable anxiety, as is shown by an address

drawn up by the clergy at Dublin in July, 1685, for transmission to the King.* And now they saw, instead of one of their own faith, another Protestant coming over to rule at Dublin Castle. As they did not know what fetters were to be put upon the hapless Clarendon, it is no marvel that they were dismayed.

* This address is printed as an appendix to King's *State of the Protestants in Ireland*, where it is stated that a copy was found amongst the papers of Tyrrel (Patrick, titular Bishop of Clogher) in Dublin. It appears interesting enough to reproduce in its entirety. It runs as follows: "Since it has pleased the Almighty Providence, by placing your Majesty upon the Throne of your Ancestors, to give you both Authority and Occasion of exercising those Royal Vertues which alone do merit and would acquire you the Crown to which you were born; We, though comprehended in the general Clemency and Indulgence which you extend to the rest of our fellow Subjects, are nevertheless so remote from your Majesty's Presence that our Prayers can have no access to you but by a Mediator. And since of all others the Earl of Tyrconnel did first espouse and chiefly maintain, these twenty-five years last past, the Cause of your poor oppressed Roman Catholick Clergy against our many and powerful Adversaries; and is now the only Subject of your Majesty under whose Fortitude and Popularity in this Kingdom we dare chearfully and with assurance own our Loyalty and assert your Majesty's Interest: [We] do make it our humble Suit to your Majesty that you will be pleased to lodge your Authority over us in his Hands, to the Terror of the Factious and Encouragement of your faithful Subjects here; since his Dependence on your Majesty is so great that we doubt not but that they will receive him with such Acclamations as the long-captivated Israelites did their Redeemer Mordecai. And since your Majesty in Glory and Power does equal the mighty Ahashuerus; and the Vertue and Beauty of your Queen is as true a Parallel to his adored Hester; We humbly beseech she may be heard as our great Patroness against that Haman, whose Pride and Ambition of being honoured as his Master may have hitherto kept us in Slavery. And tho' we wish none the fate of so dreadful an Example but rather a timely Penitence and Conversion; we yet humbly crave your Majesty's Protection against all such, if it may consist with your Royal Wisdom and Pleasure, to which we with all humility submit, in the establishing of the said Earl of Tyrconnel in such Authority here as may secure us in the exercise of our Function, to the Honour of God, and offering up our Prayers and Sacrifice for the continuation of your Majesty's long and prosperous Reign over us."

CHAPTER III

PREPARATIONS FOR THE STRUGGLE

HENRY EARL OF CLARENDON was, happily for those interested in the events of the reign of James II., a voluminous writer of letters. He also began to keep a diary, but, apparently in disgust at the course of events, broke it off in 1690. No true Hyde could live with any satisfaction to himself under a Dutch usurper; and Henry inherited his father's loyalty, though he failed to transmit it to his son. There is a strong likeness in many ways between Henry and Edward Hyde, as revealed in their own writings, though the elder man is certainly the more forceful character throughout. With a genuine piety and a certain strictness of principles (which did not, however, prevent either from accumulating fortunes) went in both cases what we can but call a narrow spirit. This fact has been mentioned in connection with the first Earl. It is very noticeable in the second

wherever he speaks of Tyrconnel. Edward Hyde disliked Irishmen and Roman Catholics, and particularly the Talbot family; Henry disliked Irishmen and Roman Catholics, as a rule, and Richard Talbot in particular. Now it cannot be denied that the second Clarendon was placed by his King in an unfair position as regards Tyrconnel after the latter's commission as Lieutenant-General. But it is obvious from his earliest letters written at Dublin that, although convinced of his own open-mindedness, he was in reality very prejudiced against him, and found in all he did a cause for complaint.

Clarendon reached Dublin on January 9th, 1686. He seems to have expected to see Tyrconnel at Holyhead on his way thither; but Tyrconnel, who was on his way to England at the same time that Clarendon was making for Ireland, sailed straight to Chester, instead of touching Holyhead, and so did not meet the new Lord-Lieutenant. Clarendon took this as intentional insult and wrote to his brother Rochester, after receiving news from England:

"I wonder Lord Tyrconnel should take so much pains to have some people believe he would have put in at Holyhead if he could; when everybody here knows the wind was so fair that he might more easily have done it than have gone to Chester. But Captain Sheldon, who went over with him, hearing him speak so much in publick, the morning he left this place, of stopping at Holyhead to see my Lord-Lieutenant, asked him:

'My Lord, why do you say this, when we all who go with you know that you do not intend it?' His answer was, 'Prethee let me alone: I know what I say.' When several persons here, Irish, asked His Lordship of me and concerning me, &c., his answer was that he knew nothing of me more than by sight; that he had no manner of acquaintance with me. This some of themselves here have told me when they have heard me speak of him in discourse as one I was acquainted with. One cannot help smiling at this."

Clarendon goes on in the same letter to speak of Tyrconnel's querulousness while last in Dublin, and how he heard that he would make complaint to the authorities and then, even if all he desired was done, he would go away dissatisfied because there was not so much ground of complaint as he wished. "How is it possible to understand such a man?" asks Clarendon. Still he assures his brother, "I speak not of him to anyone here but with that respect which is due to his quality and to one I have lived well with; though I cannot help hearing others speak slightly of him, which I discountenance all I can. Some few more of the extravagancies he has committed between Chester and London, in his last journey, will do his business."

The last sentence is interesting as being the foundation of Macaulay's very picturesque description of Tyrconnel's conduct on his way to London now. What Clarendon means, possibly, is that Tyrconnel behaved indiscreetly for a martyr to gout. A little

From an Indian ink drawing in the National Portrait Gallery, Dublin, after "a Painting in the hands of Mr. Sykes, painter in Lincoln's Inn Fields."

RICHARD TALBOT, DUKE OF TYRCONNEL.

later we hear of him visiting Bath—for the third time, within our fragmentary knowledge, in his life—and there can be no doubt that he went there for a course of the waters. On his return to Ireland in June he was anxious to leave again as soon as possible for England, to "attend his health." Of the extent to which gout tortured him we shall have proof later. "He was now no longer young," says Macaulay, "and was expiating by severe sufferings the dissoluteness of his youth."* Corpulent and full-blooded gentlemen of fifty-five would have a difficulty in vindicating their early lives against the assaults of so able a pleader. In such an argument the gout not only punishes the dissoluteness, but it also proves it. At least, no other evidence is thought necessary.

Tyrconnel's visit to England was not directly occasioned by his gout, however; still less by a desire to avoid meeting Clarendon. He had been sent for by the King to discuss the carrying-out of the scheme, which was already in contemplation before Charles's death, for making the Irish army a real safeguard to the dynasty instead of being merely a garrison to protect the settlers, which had been its function hitherto. Ormonde's removal was the first step in the direction of the separation of the civil and military administrations

* The historian continues: "Age and disease had made no essential change in his character and manners. He still"—we should, of course, have expected age and disease to sweeten him in this respect—"whenever he opened his mouth, ranted, cursed and swore with such frantic violence that superficial observers set him down for the wildest of libertines."

in Ireland. Tyrconnel's position during the interregnum between Ormonde and Clarendon was somewhat irregular, but the Lords Justices were not disposed to quarrel with one so obviously a favourite of the King, even if he seemed to exceed his official powers. With a Lord-Lieutenant again at Dublin, however, it was necessary to define the extent of Tyrconnel's authority, and thus let Clarendon know that he was not to enjoy the same military power as his predecessors in office.

Tyrconnel arrived in England in time to have bestowed upon him a post which had just fallen vacant by the death of Ormonde's son Arran. Arran was Marshal of Ireland, and to this more or less honorary position Tyrconnel succeeded at the end of January, 1686. The real work intended for him, however, was indicated by the commission issued to him on the following March 1st, when he was made Lieutenant-General. At the same time commissions were issued to Colonel Justin MacCarty as Major-General and to Colonel Richard Hamilton as Brigadier; and on March 2nd to Sir Thomas Newcomen as Brigadier also. The last-named, a Privy Councillor and Colonel of a foot regiment in Ireland under Ormonde, had married Tyrconnel's sister Frances, widow of James Cusack. Clarendon, when he reached Dublin in January, had found him, as well as MacCarty and Richard Hamilton, extremely anxious to be allowed to go to England. In the cases of Newcomen and MacCarty Clarendon

was aware of their object; for both avowed their hopes of becoming Major-General. Clarendon granted them leave from Ireland, sending with MacCarty letters of recommendation to both the King and Lord Sunderland. Newcomen he cordially detested.*

Richard Hamilton, to Clarendon's annoyance, had applied for leave elsewhere before coming to him. Clarendon writes to his brother that on February 20th Hamilton came to him and told him that, having some business in England, he had written to Tyrconnel for the King's leave and had heard from Tyrconnel that it had been granted. He now asked for the Lord-Lieutenant's licence and promised to be back in May. As Hamilton had only arrived in Ireland a fortnight before himself, Clarendon twitted him with being "unable to live out of the sweet town of London"; but he did not see how to refuse his request. He told Rochester, however, of his intention of writing to Sunderland in the matter, for "it were to be wished that when officers send in to England for leave to go over it might not be granted, but that they should be directed to apply to the chief governour."

* Writing to Rochester of his permission to Newcomen to leave Ireland, Clarendon says: "If he does not gain his desire I shall not be sorry, nor will anybody else here; for I never knew a man more hated. He pursues his brother-in-law's designs; and yet even that party do not esteem him, nor know how to believe him. He is reputed a brave man in his person, but false and treacherous to the highest degree." Soon after Clarendon writes again that Newcomen, "everybody knows, is no soldier, wretchedly sordid, and a brute; and I never heard of any title he had to merit but his alliance"—*i.e.*, with Tyrconnel's sister.

The poor "chief governour" little guessed what a blow was to be struck at him soon with regard to military affairs in Ireland; or that the very minister to whom he spoke of writing was prepared to see his authority not merely restricted, but altogether taken from him. It is uncertain at what date the compact between Sunderland, Father Petre, Harry Jermyn and Tyrconnel had its birth. King James in his *Memoirs* writes of "a consultation soon after His Majesty's accession to the throne betwixt this Lord [Sunderland], Father Petre, Mr. Germin and my Lord Tyrconnel, where it was agreed that Father Petre should be a Cardinal, Lord Sunderland Lord Treasurer, Lord Tyrconnel Lord Lieftenant of Ireland (who engaged to procure my Lord Sunderland five thousand pounds per annum out of that kingdom or fifty thousand pounds in mony), and that Mr. Henry Germin should be made Lord and Captain of the Hors Guards."

Jermyn's title of Baron Dover was soon procured for him. But the other plans of the conspirators were not so easy of execution. In the first place, Sunderland's position was very insecure on James's accession. He had favoured his exclusion from the throne as Duke of York, to mention no other causes of offence. But James was not proof against the talents of this prince of traitors. By the time that Tyrconnel returned to England in January, 1686, Sunderland had riveted his evil influence on his unhappy

master. In the previous December he had received the appointment of Lord President of the Council, in addition to the Secretaryship of State to which Charles had appointed him. He already held every string whereby to work affairs to his profit, whatever should befall. His power of commending himself to whomsoever he wished was extraordinary, even when we allow for his utter lack of scruple in attaining his end.* Clarendon and Rochester both believed him their friend, for instance, while he was planning to ruin them both; the latter because he stood in the light of his illegal amassing of a fortune, the former because he was in the way of Tyrconnel's schemes in Ireland. There is no reason to suppose that he had any personal liking for Tyrconnel; but the latter had taken the precaution, as we know, of purchasing his assistance, having been well trained by his previous experiences to deal with such creatures as the Lord President of the Council.

Sunderland and Tyrconnel are found associated together in a curious story of this period. Among the "ugly mistresses" on whom James, as Duke of York, was rallied, Catherine, daughter of the wit and rake

* The Princess Anne, however, was one who escaped his fascination entirely. She summed him up correctly, if quaintly, when she described him to her sister Mary of Orange as "the subtillest workinest villain that is on the face of the earth." His wife was of a piece with him. Anne declares that she is "a flattering, dissembling, false woman, but she has so fawning and endearing a way that she will deceive any body at first, and it is not possible to find out all her ways in a little time." With the necessary change of genders the same words might have been used of her husband.

Sir Charles Sedley, was the last to have any hold over him. In view of the disparaging way in which this lady's name has been handled, it is well to remember that once Jack Churchill, as he then was called, was supposed to be engaged to her. If she developed a looseness of character akin to her father's, she inherited some of his talents. In particular she had that quality of wit which appealed to James, a man commonly said to have been without it himself. On coming to the throne he did not, as his Roman Catholic subjects above all hoped he would, put her away altogether. This is clear not only from English sources of information, but also from Barillon's letters to Louis. The old but scarcely venerable William Chiffinch was still alive to perform his duties as Page of the Backstairs and Keeper of the King's Closet, and the Court was not ignorant of the continuance of the intrigue. Towards the end of January, 1686, James bestowed on the lady the title of Countess of Dorchester, and immediately there was a rumour that she was to have the former lodgings of the Duchess of Portsmouth at Whitehall. The Roman Catholic courtiers indignantly accused Lord Rochester and his wife (Henrietta, daughter of Richard Boyle, Earl of Burlington) of using their influence to persuade the King to retain the Countess near him; while they endeavoured to procure her dismissal by working on his religious susceptibilities. Writing to his niece, Lady Rutland, about "the new Countess," on February 6th, Peregrine Bertie says:

"Father Gifford pressed the King extreamly to remove her, and was seconded by four greate Lords, Sunderland, Tarconnings,* Arundell of Warder, and Dover, who all told him the advantage it gave to the enemy to retain a Protestant mistress. . . . The King's answer was that Father Gifford had spoke to him about the Countess of Do[r]chester, and that hee tooke it very kindly from him, being a very religious man; but for their parts he said this was the first time he tooke them for Divines, and that he was sure they spoke not out of religion, but some private piques, and bid them for the future not concern themselves with things that did noe way relate to them."

King James, however, had made up his mind to dismiss a cause of so much offence to his subjects of his own faith. His young Queen, too—Mary Beatrice, though thirteen years a wife, was still only twenty-seven—exhibited so much determination in the matter that he could scarcely have refused her demand,† even if he had felt much affection for Catherine Sedley, which the all-knowing Barillon says he did not. He only insisted that the patent for her title should be passed, and then at the end of February she left for Ireland, where he had previously given her an estate.

* This is Bertie's spelling of Tyrconnel. Lord Sunderland, it is to be noticed, here appears openly among the Roman Catholics, although his public avowal was delayed until two years later.

† Barillon, in his letter of February 7th (new style), tells Louis that the Queen declared flatly that she would not tolerate the proposed public scandal, that she would not see the new Countess, and that if the King did not part with her she herself would retire to a convent, in whatever country it might be.

Tyrconnel's intervention in the affair in the character of a "Divine" had been unwelcome to his master; but James bore him no grudge for it, giving him his commission as Lieutenant-General in Ireland almost immediately after. Reports flew about of what was going to happen in Ireland. Clarendon writes to Rochester from Dublin before the appointment has been published: "This is a very tattling town; but the talk of the town is usually founded on newsletters from England. The last of these said that Tyrconnel was to be made Duke of Leinster and Marquis of Dublin; and that he is making haste hither to have a principal command in the army and bringing thirty commissions with him for alterations in the army; and that all the courts of justice are to be totally changed."

Ten days later Clarendon tells his brother that the Irish are very foolish in magnifying Tyrconnel's power. "It is most certain," he continues, "before he went hence he did openly brag what alterations should be made, both civil and military. By his discourses one would have thought that he had the absolute dominion to get the King to do whatever he proposed. As to the Chancellor, one day Lord T——, discoursing with some of his friends, and railing at the Chancellor (which, it seems, he gives himself a great liberty of doing against any one he does not like), a gentleman in the company, a Roman Catholick, said: 'My Lord, what can you say against him? He carries himself well in

his office; and when any of us Irish come before him in his court, we find justice with dispatch.' To which Lord T—— replied: 'That is true; but that is his craft, to be civil to us. But I know he does not love our countrymen, the natives; and, by God, I will have him out, you shall see.'* To which the other said, 'I doubt, my Lord, this way will not serve the King.' To tell these stories which go up and down here of Lord Tyrconnel's behaviour in this kingdom, the insolence he shewed to some, the courtship he made to others, and the contempt he used most people with, would make one who knows him wonder. Certainly he's a man of monstrous vanity, as well as pride and furious passion. But, as I cannot avoid sometimes hearing extravagant stories of him, I do assure you I make no reflection upon them; and never mention his name, but when occasionally discourses bring it in; nor shall there ever any thing be laid to my charge upon the account of my ill conduct towards him, whether present or absent."

Among those who talked largely of what changes Tyrconnel was about to make in Ireland was the young Lord Dongan; that is, Walter, son of Tyrconnel's nephew William, Earl of Limerick. According to Clarendon, Dongan was "a very prattling impertinent youth, and forward enough." As he was

* In this same letter Clarendon mentions that he has just acquainted the Chancellor (Boyle) of "the King's pleasure to give him his ease." Tyrconnel's boast, therefore, seems to have been no empty one. The new Chancellor was Charles Porter, knighted by the King at the same time that he appointed him.

devoted to his great-uncle's interests, we need not accept this criticism of him as entirely fair. Early in April the young man asked and obtained leave to go over to England, which "makes great discourse" in Dublin, says Clarendon. "Those officers of the army who are lately come out of England say he is gone with his uncle Lord T——'s direction to kiss the King's hand for a troop of horse, which they say he is to have upon the changes: and truly that seems very likely. But others will have it that he is become a statesman and is gone upon some deep matters relating to the Catholick cause." As a matter of fact, Dongan was appointed captain in his great-uncle's troop. Later he was to have his own regiment of dragoons, in which command we shall hear of him again.

Clarendon did not believe that the King would consent to anything that would disgrace or mortify him. But he was expectant of trouble from Tyrconnel. The spirit in which he was prepared to meet this is illustrated in a curious letter to Rochester, in which we may recognise some of the self-complacency of the elder Clarendon, but not much of his fearless soul. "I will not be angry," he says; "no, though my Lord T—— should bring down the commissions of the officers of the army (as some people here credibly report he will) yet I will not be angry. Nay, let him, when he is here, carry himself as it is generally believed he will, and feared by some of his wiser countrymen; yet I will not be angry: nothing shall provoke me to

be out of temper. And I will have the vanity to tell you (though a man ought not to brag of his virtues) that it is not in any man's power to say he has seen me in the least passion since my being here: though perhaps I have had some provocations which other men would not have been so silent in."*

During part of the time while Dublin was eagerly discussing what was to happen on his return, Tyrconnel was taking a course of the waters at Bath. When he went and how long he stayed does not appear; but he returned to London on April 27th to make his preparations for departure to Ireland. A month later he started on his way—"with what powers or instructions," wrote Ormonde in London to his friend Southwell, "is not known, at least to me, nor, as I think, to others that know abundantly more than I do."

* In a later letter he says: "I never had yet any difference with my Lord Tyrconnel; and I cannot imagine why he and I should not agree in the King's business as well as any others. And I am sure the King knows I will be advised by my Lord Tyrconnel or any others in the affairs of the army, or in any other matters, as he commands me: and therefore I give no credit to those reports, knowing well His Majesty will not lessen any man in the authority he ought to have in the station he has put him and which he has given him by his commission."

Macaulay is exceedingly unfair to Clarendon when, commenting on his statement that he never yet had any difference with Tyrconnel, he says: "Clarendon appears not to have recollected that there had once been a plot to ruin the fame of his innocent sister, and that in that plot Tyrconnel had borne a chief share. This is not exactly one of the injuries which high-spirited men most readily pardon. But, in that wicked court where the Hydes had long been pushing their fortunes, such injuries were easily forgiven and forgotten, not from magnanimity or Christian charity, but from mere baseness and want of moral sensibility." We have seen on what evidence Richard Talbot's share in the plot against Anne Hyde rests.

Before leaving London Tyrconnel had an unfortunate collision with the brother of the man with whom he was going to share the government of Ireland. Rochester, in spite of what discredit may have fallen upon him in connection with the Dorchester affair, was still powerful at Whitehall and continued to champion the Anglican section of King James's supporters as opposed to Sunderland and the Roman Catholics. As Treasurer of England he expected to have a voice in the financial affairs of Ireland, and, moreover, there were his brother's interests to be considered. We will leave the story to be told in the words of Sir S. Howe, writing to the Countess of Rutland on June 2nd: "The night before Lord Terconnell went for Irland, there happened a quarrell between the two great Lords, about making Trent,* a great Papist as well as a knowne great knave, vice Treasurer of Irland, which Lord Treasurer opposed with that violence that they parted with great anger on both sides. Lord Tirconnell's gone with full power to propegate the Roman Catholic religion there, and place and displace whom he pleases. Lord Clarendon," adds Howe, "has behaved himself extreamly well there, and has given the Protestants great incoragments, for which he will most certainly bee sent for home."

And now at last Lord-Lieutenant and Lieutenant-General were to meet face to face. Clarendon's letters

* *i.e.*, Patrick Trant, soon to be knighted and to be made a Commissioner of the Revenue in Ireland.

to his brother became even more full and vivid than before, and since they are our only source of information as to the encounters between the two, it will be necessary to draw upon them largely in the following pages. After what has been said in the present chapter it will be unnecessary to repeat the warning that with regard to Tyrconnel Clarendon's account cannot be accepted as fair and unbiassed. We have a picture, drawn by an honest but in many ways a bigoted man, of one between whom and himself, however much at first he pretended to shut his eyes, there were a thousand causes of offence.

CHAPTER IV

CLARENDON V. TYRCONNEL

"TO-DAY about noon," writes Clarendon to Rochester on June 5th, 1686, "notice was brought me that the yacht was in the bay; upon which I sent my coach to Dunlary to meet my Lord Tyrconnel. He first set down his lady at his house and then came to the Castle: he was with me between 4 and 5 of the clock. After the usual salutations he delivered me the King's letters, which, he told me, we might discourse upon at leisure. He told me he had brought all the commissions, which should be presently sent to me: but he desired he might see the list which my Lord President had sent me (for he had none) before they were given out."

After Clarendon had made an appointment for the following afternoon to discuss the matter of the commissions, Tyrconnel told him that "he longed to be out of town and to despatch the business of the army, that he might go over again into England to attend his health." The next day, which was a Sunday, he came

to dinner at the Castle, and in Clarendon's private room afterwards urged the speedy delivery of the commissions, to enable him to leave Dublin soon; "for he longed to make haste back into England for his health, which is every foot the burden of the song."

Clarendon now thought his visitor was taking his leave, when suddenly "His Lordship began a rambling discourse." Immediately after his departure Clarendon made a note of what had been said, which he embodied in a letter to his brother two days later. Hence we have what should be a fairly faithful report of a very curious conversation.

"My Lord," began Tyrconnel, "I am sent hither to view this army and to give the King an account of it. Here are great alterations to be made; and the poor people who are put out think it my doing; and, God damn me, I have little or nothing to do in the matter. For I told the King I knew not two of the captains nor other inferior officers in the whole army. I know there are some hard cases, which I am sorry for; but, by God, I know not how to help them. You must know, my Lord, the King, who is a Roman Catholic, is resolved to employ his subjects of that religion, as you will find by the letters I have brought you, and therefore some must be put out to make room for such as the King likes. And I can tell you another thing, the King will not keep one man in his service who ever served under the usurpers."

Clarendon answered that there was no need to tell

him this, for he did not take it upon himself to enquire how or why any man was put out of or into the army. It was his duty to obey the King's commands. He then went on to the subject of the "hard cases" of which Tyrconnel had spoken, and mentioned that of a Lieutenant-Colonel Maguire, whom he himself thought a man of merit.

"My Lord, you do not know all," said Tyrconnel. "Besides all you have said I will tell you what I know to be true. That gentleman, in the late years of persecution, received and sheltered all the poor Catholics who came to him; and, by God, to have him now laid aside is a terrible thing. But, my Lord, when that is done, I would not have you represent any of their cases, which will anger the King and perplex him."

Clarendon then spoke of the resolution to employ none who had ever served under Cromwell and his officers. He must have been well aware of this, for the point had been mentioned in both the patents of Charles II. to Rochester and of James to himself as Lord-Lieutenant. Nevertheless, he now expressed the hope that no positive rule would be made against such men, since it could not be observed, as His Lordship knew.

"Who are they who are now employed who ever served the usurpers?" asked Tyrconnel abruptly. But the Lord-Lieutenant was not to be drawn. He did not doubt, he said, that His Majesty was well satisfied with those whom he employed and that,

therefore, as long as they behaved themselves, he would not start objections against them. "And so I left His Lordship to find out whom I meant," observes Clarendon.

Tyrconnel rose from his chair with a passionate exclamation: "By God, my Lord, these Acts of Settlement and this New Interest are damned things!"

Clarendon deprecated the discussion of such matters. "Neither you nor I," he said, "are well informed of all the motives and inducements which carried on those affairs twenty-six years since."

"Yes," retorted Tyrconnel angrily, "we *do* know all those arts and damned roguery contrivances which procured those Acts."

"My Lord, I do not know what you mean," Clarendon said. The King would not have the Acts of Settlement disturbed, he continued, and it was the business of Tyrconnel and himself, and of everybody else, to endeavour to reconcile people, to disperse jealousies, and to unite all to the common interest, so that trade in Ireland might flourish and the King's revenue might be increased.

The other could not deny this. "I know the Acts of Settlement must not be touched, and, by God, it would make a confusion if they should." But he mentioned a compromise which had been suggested to him by the Lord Chief Justice Keating and Sir John Temple before he left Ireland in January, that

the New Interest men might be willing to give up a third, or even a half, of their land if the remainder were secured to them permanently. From what they surrendered money might be raised to help those who were in want.

Clarendon expressed his willingness to listen to the views of the gentlemen mentioned, or of anyone else recommended by Tyrconnel, if they would come to him. Then the conversation ended. "Well, I will say no more at present," were Tyrconnel's last words. "But, by God, my Lord, here have been foul damned things done here."*

And so, writes Clarendon, "after an hour and half discoursing at this rate (for he is a loose and confused talker) we parted."

Next morning Tyrconnel was at the Castle again as early as nine o'clock, explaining that he had much to say. The Lord-Lieutenant politely answered that he should have as much time as he pleased. After some discussion on the subject of the commissions, Tyrconnel said that there was another reform to be made in the Irish army. "For, God damn me," he cried, "this Scotch battalion which is newly come into England has undone us. The King is so pleased with it that he will have all his forces in the same posture. We have here a great many old men and of different statures.

* It must be admitted that what Dibdin says of Steevens the book-hunter is applicable to Tyrconnel: "His language was too frequently the language of imprecation." But the oaths doubtless lost nothing by Clarendon's recording of them, temperate as he was in language himself.

They must all be turned out, for the King would have all his men young and of one size."

Clarendon pleaded that at least the older men might not be turned out of the army until a military hospital, founded by Charles II. and contributed to by the men themselves, should be ready for their reception. "Well, we will talk of it again," said Tyrconnel. "Something must be done; but, by God, the men must out. And, hang them, they have had the King's pay a great while!"

As here reported, Tyrconnel's words sound harsh and unfeeling. But it must be remembered that he habitually spoke very emphatically and that his sufferings from gout did not tend to make him gentler in his speech; while it is not likely that Clarendon softened the expressions in retailing them to his brother. Tyrconnel, too, had a task in hand which it was exceedingly difficult to carry out tactfully. The army was firstly to be purged of the Cromwellian element, which was with good reason considered a danger to the Crown.* The Cromwellian soldiers were of course the oldest men in the force, and the readiest way of getting rid of them was on the score of their age. Clarendon was only asking for justice when he

* King (*State of the Protestants in Ireland*, 57-8) speaks of the Irish army at James's accession consisting of "as loyal men and as cordial to the King's Service as anyone could be" and as "looking on him as their Master and Father, entirely depending on him and expecting nothing from anybody else." It is only necessary to read Carte's *Life of Ormond* to see how doubtful was the loyalty of this army even under Charles II., not a professed Roman Catholic like his brother.

said that the hospital should be ready for them before they were turned out. But Tyrconnel's instructions, founded no doubt on his own suggestions, were for immediate "reform" of the troops under him. The only diplomacy which it occurred to him to use was to say beforehand that the changes would be few—which he knew to be untrue, we cannot deny. He knew that the intention was not merely to discharge all the Cromwellians, officers and men, but to convert the force from what it was now into an army practically Roman Catholic throughout. There is this to be said in defence of his falsehood, that the King's interests demanded that the scheme should not be prematurely revealed. It was more consistent with Tyrconnel's nature to blurt out the truth, as indeed he did, to his own embarrassment, when he escaped from the restraint of Dublin into the provinces.

He was anxious, after he had reviewed the Royal Regiment in St. Stephen's Green and put its new officers in their commands, to proceed to the country garrisons. Still keeping up the form of taking his orders from the Lord-Lieutenant, on June 9th he asked "when he should be despatched into the country? For (said he) I would fain have done everything, that I might return into England." Clarendon said he might go when he pleased. Conversation then turned to the question of the admission of Roman Catholics into the corporations and their appointment as justices and sheriffs; all of which Clarendon knew

by his instructions he was expected to forward. Concerning the sheriffs Tyrconnel flared up. "By God, my Lord," he exclaimed, "I must needs tell you the sheriffs you made are generally rogues and old Cromwellians. But I justified Your Excellency to the King and told him you were not to be blamed; that you could not at that time know people yourself and were advised by the late Chancellor." Clarendon protested that these sheriffs, generally speaking, were "as good a set of men as any that had been chosen these dozen years." "By God, I believe it," Tyrconnel replied; "for there has not been an honest man sheriff in Ireland these twenty years!"

Next day Tyrconnel took his wife to his country house outside Dublin. It appears that he had now acquired the old home at Carton or Cartown, which he renamed Talbotstown—probably at the time when he received his peerage, as his barony was of Talbotstown. This house being within easy reach of Dublin, he made a morning call on the Lord-Lieutenant on the 11th, bringing with him his brother-in-law Newcomen and Richard Hamilton, for whom he had developed a great liking. Together they all discussed the quartering of the Irish army until dinner-time approached and Clarendon invited them to stay for the meal. Upstairs Tyrconnel took him aside and said: "The more I think of some of these changes, the more I am grieved. Who a devil named these men I know not." They agreed, in one particularly

unjust case, to delay turning out the superseded officer, Tyrconnel exclaiming emphatically: "God damn those who represented these men to the King. I am sure I had nothing to do in it."

Clarendon probably did not believe these assertions, having by this time, as his confidences to his brother show, conceived a violent aversion from his nominal Lieutenant-General. It was certainly very galling to him to have to put up with not only his independent action in military affairs, but also his interference in the civil sphere. Four days after his previous visit Tyrconnel appeared again at the Castle and was very insistent and impatient about the admission of the Roman Catholics into the corporations and municipal offices. He objected to Clarendon's choice of mayor and sheriffs of Dublin for the next year. All three were as ill men as could be chosen, he complained. Did Lord Tyrconnel say that out of his own knowledge? queried Clarendon.

"I know none of the men myself," was the answer; "only one of the sheriffs was heretofore my tailor, whom I never heard well of. But since I saw you on Saturday, very good men, Roman Catholics and Protestants, have given me this account of them." Then it was strange, said Clarendon, that no one had told him so. "My Lord," said Tyrconnel, "you must not wonder many come to me who will not trouble Your Excellency. I hope you are not angry that men apply themselves to me. I shall always tell

you things as soon as I hear them." He was not angry, Clarendon protested; but why should Tyrconnel's informants make any difficulty of coming to him? He was sure he was easy of access to all. "Why then, my Lord, I will tell you plainly (for you shall always find me a plain man), these men who have been with me do apprehend you are inclined the other way. . . . I myself have no reason to think you partial. I only tell you what people say."

The Lord-Lieutenant's indignation was now really roused and he pressed to be told why he was accused of being "inclined the other way." All he could get out of Tyrconnel for the moment was, "By God, my Lord, you must not wonder if the Catholics do think you a little partial after your making such a set of sheriffs, who are four parts of five rogues." But Clarendon returned to the point three days later and obtained the names of two gentlemen who had accused him.

Tyrconnel's gout was again troubling him severely, and he determined therefore to combine a cure with his inspection of the forces. Clarendon, in going through the formality of giving him orders for the inspection, asked him to be a little careful in view of the alarm caused by the military changes and not to frighten people into believing that the King meant to exclude any of his subjects—that is to say, the Protestants—from his service. "By God, my Lord," Tyrconnel answered, "I never asked a soldier in my

life what religion he was of." Some of the Roman Catholic officers, Clarendon told him, had talked very foolishly and publicly in another strain. The Chief Justice Keating—they had all three come back to the Castle together from a Privy Council meeting—also warned Tyrconnel that nothing could be more prejudicial to the King's service than that it should be thought no Englishman must be in it. "To which my Lord Tyrconnel replied, more calmly than he uses to speak, that he would take care there should be no complaint."

On June 17th Tyrconnel took leave of the Lord-Lieutenant "with a thousand compliments of friendship, &c.," and went home to Talbotstown, to start for Wexford next day. "Whether my Lord Tyrconnel will continue to be so terrible as he is at present," says a letter to Rochester, "nothing but time will determine: at present nothing can more dissatisfy honest men than the ranting, swaggering way he is in, and the abominable insolent language he treats men with. He has very good council given him by some Roman Catholicks, whom he cursed to ten thousand devils for their pains. He is gone to the waters; which, it is hoped, may call [? cool] him. If not, he will be looked upon as a man beside himself."

The changes already made and the rumours of those to come were having a most disastrous effect in Ireland, Clarendon complains. "It is impossible to tell you the alterations that are grown in men within this

month: but the last week . . . 120 people went in one ship from hence to Chester; and multitudes are preparing from all parts of the kingdom to be gone as fast as they can get in their debts and dispose of their stocks."

Clarendon was not exaggerating when he wrote thus of the scare among the Irish Protestants. The appointment of a number of Roman Catholics to the Privy Council, including Tyrconnel himself, the Earl of Limerick, Major-General Justin MacCarty, and Colonel Richard Hamilton; the orders for the admission of Roman Catholics into the corporations and various offices; and the steady progress of the remodelling of the army, revealing the intended Romanisation of the force; these were sufficient to cause consternation in a less nervous community than that of the colonists in Ireland. And in addition there was a rumour of more authority to be bestowed on the Lieutenant-General at the expense of the Lord-Lieutenant. "I am just now informed," writes Clarendon on June 19th, "from a good hand that my Lord Tyrconnel has sent into England for larger powers."* Even worse was threatened. "This morning," says Clarendon on July 6th, "a very worthy person and man of quality told me . . . that Mr. Chetwood, my Lord Dartmouth's

* He continues: "Sure, methinks, the King might think how by his letter he has retrenched the power and authority he gave me under the Great Seal; and I do not know that I deserve that mortification, which will make all the world quickly look upon me as a most pitiful creature." In a letter to Sunderland three days later he speaks in an equally mournful strain of the treatment which he has received.

chaplain, had written to his brother here that my Lord Tyrconnel would get me recalled within six months; and therefore he advised his brother to leave this kingdom."

On July 19th Tyrconnel returned to Dublin, his primary object being to review the Guards for the first time since the new recruits had been admitted to their ranks. On the following day Clarendon reports to Sunderland a long conversation with Tyrconnel on the remodelling of the army, in the course of which Tyrconnel had said that "the King would have no distinction made between his subjects; and he himself had never put out a man for being a Protestant nor taken in one because he was a Roman Catholic, but always chose those men who seemed most likely to serve the King, without asking what religion they were of."

The truth of this statement, as far as it concerned himself, was very soon challenged. On the 21st, after a Privy Council meeting, Clarendon invited Tyrconnel and Lord Chancellor Porter to the Castle. He spoke to Tyrconnel about some orders which he was alleged to have given at a recent inspection at Kilkenny, that only Roman Catholics were to be admitted into the army. Who reported such a thing of him? demanded Tyrconnel. Lord Roscommon* and other officers, he

* *i.e.*, Cary Dillon, fifth Earl of Roscommon. He was uncle to Wentworth Dillon, who married Isabella Boynton, and succeeded him when he died without issue in January, 1684. He was a Protestant and at the end of 1688 had himself presented to the Prince of Orange, for which he was not unnaturally attainted by King James. Isabella, like her uncle-in-law, turned Williamite, and was attainted also.

was told. He firmly denied it. "But whilst we were together, it happened that my Lord Roscommon was in the next room, booted, newly come to town. . . . Indeed, it was a very extraordinary thing between my Lords Tyrconnel and Roscommon; the latter coming in so pat into the room, when everybody thought him out of town." Challenged as to what orders the Lieutenant-General had given him, Roscommon said that he had charged him to put no men into the vacancies in his regiment except Roman Catholics. Tyrconnel answered that he could not have committed such an absurdity. "God's wounds," said he, "to ask a soldier, if he comes well mounted and be a likely fellow, what religion he is of, is a ridiculous thing." As Roscommon persisted in his statement, "my Lord Tyrconnel, smiling, said, 'God damn me, Cary, I could not give such orders; for I knew you had taken some Roman Catholicks into your troop. Prithee let us talk a little, what past, how could I bid thee do so?' Then my Lord Roscommon replied, 'My Lord, I will say anything you will have me; but, by God, I will not deny the truth. If I were now to die, I must declare that you commanded me, upon my allegiance, to admit none but Roman Catholicks into the regiment; and your Lordship knows you have given the same orders to several officers of the other regiment.' 'By God,' says my Lord Tyrconnel, 'that is strange.'"

It is impossible to come to any other conclusion

from this narrative than that Tyrconnel was an exceedingly poor liar. He had been instructed to proceed cautiously with the conversion of the army into a Roman Catholic body, and having by his indiscreet tongue let out the secret before officers who were not even of his own faith, he now floundered hopelessly as he realised his mistake. It is not by such unskilful blundering in mendacity that he would have won the title of "Lying Dick Talbot," which Lord Macaulay, following the author of *The State of the Protestants in Ireland*, pretends was his.

Tyrconnel plainly showed his confusion when he next visited Dublin Castle. In the course of a discussion one hour and a half long with the Lord-Lieutenant, he "fell into cursing and swearing that he could not imagine why the bringing in a few Popish officers and soldiers should make such jealousies and apprehensions among people that they must lose their lands and the Acts of Settlement were broken, when it would appear, after he had made all the alterations he now designed, that there would not be a seventh part of the army Roman Catholick." Clarendon pointed out that of two thousand three hundred new men put in since Tyrconnel arrived, two thousand were Roman Catholics,* and that some of the officers and men boasted that by Christmas Day there would not be an Englishman or a Protestant in the Irish army.

* In a letter to the King on August 14th, 1686, Clarendon says that 2,000 is a fourth part of the whole Irish army.

Some course, he urged, must be taken to prevent such talk as this.

Tyrconnel made no reply to this except that he would see him after the inspection of the regiments in Ulster, on which he was starting at the end of the month. He would be away a week, and very quickly after his return, he said, he would be going to England.

Before he went north, however, Tyrconnel figures in one more curious scene described by Clarendon to Rochester, which we will leave in Clarendon's own words. He is writing on Saturday, July 31st, from Chapel Izod, where he was spending the nights and part of the daytime during the hot weather, only visiting the Castle once daily. "On Thursday in the afternoon," he says, "my Lady Longford and some other company who had dined here went to visit Lady Tyrconnel, the house being about eight miles off. My sister* went with them. She tells me my Lord was at home, and that he singled her from the rest of the company. After some common things he asked her what her husband was gone for into England? She told him he had several projects on foot, and that he hoped to succeed in some or other of them, that they might be able to live; for they were at present very low in their fortunes. 'I hate a project,' said he; 'Why do not your brothers do something for him?' She says she told him that she

* "My sister Frank," as Clarendon calls her elsewhere. After her husband's departure for England she appears to have lived with her brother until he left Ireland in February, 1687.

doubted not her brothers' kindness to her when it was in their power. To which he replied, 'My Lord-Lieutenant may provide for you when he pleases. Here is Price, the Receiver-General, a great rascal. Why does not your brother turn him out and put your husband into his place? Do you know Price to be an ill man?' 'No, indeed, my Lord,' said she; 'I only know that he has been always very civil to me.' 'And,' said he, 'here is Bridges, a Commissioner of the Revenue, a damned fanatick. He is kept in by your brothers. Get my Lord-Lieutenant to put him out and to bring in your husband there.' She says she answered that she nor her husband desired to make their fortunes by ruining others; and, so, after many compliments and professions of how much he would serve her, the conversation ended, as she tells me."

On August 5th Tyrconnel, having inspected the Northern troops, returned to Talbotstown. He called at the Castle two days later, arranged to be present at a meeting there the following week, and once more expressed his intention of going to England quickly. As he had from the start spoken of his anxiety to get back, there was nothing necessarily suspicious in his declaration now. But Clarendon had, during his absence in Ulster, been discussing his behaviour with various people, including Sir Charles Porter, Major-General MacCarty, and a certain Mr. Nihill, a rising young lawyer from Limerick, who had lately been made of the King's Council. Nihill in particular

(whom Clarendon considered "very proud and pert if no worse," but yet listened to him) gave him a very ill name. Porter was burning to meet Tyrconnel, because he heard that he had been saying that he, the Lord Chancellor, had taken a bribe of £10,000 from the Whigs. And MacCarty sympathized, or pretended to sympathize, with Porter, swearing that if Tyrconnel was not a friend to his Lordship, neither should he be one to him. Primed with what he had heard, the Lord-Lieutenant was ready to believe anything of Tyrconnel. But, it must be noted, the only result was to make him more bitter against him in his letters. To his face he still continued as mild and long-suffering as before.

The meeting which had been arranged between Clarendon and Tyrconnel took place at the Castle on August 13th. To it had been invited also the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Chief Justice; the Solicitor-General; Stephen Rice (Chief Baron of the Exchequer); Major-General MacCarty; Colonel Richard Hamilton; and a Mr. Richard Nagle, a Roman Catholic lawyer of good standing in his profession, who had recently been appointed to the Irish Privy Council. Thanks to his own talents and to the patronage of Tyrconnel, Nagle was destined soon to rise high. Clarendon's first impression of Nagle was that he was "a very honest and able man"—though he disapproved of a practising lawyer being put on the Privy Council—but he later modified his opinion as to his honesty.

The object of the meeting was to discuss a Commission of Grace, which the Lord-Lieutenant had strongly recommended to the King, whereby the Settlement of Ireland was to be confirmed, while the original owners of the estates involved were to be indemnified. Clarendon believed that nothing short of a confirmation of the Settlement would quiet the apprehensions of His Majesty's subjects in Ireland. It is obvious that he was thinking of the colonists rather than of anyone else, though he wished to be just to the rest. Tyrconnel, however, whose aim for so many years had been restoration, not indemnification, of the old Irish proprietors of the land, would not hear of Clarendon's scheme; and MacCarty seconded his chief vigorously. Keating alone supported the Lord-Lieutenant; Rice, Nagle, and "those of their opinion" temporising and holding that nothing should be done except through Parliament. After three hours of argument the meeting broke up without coming to any agreement. In his irritation Clarendon wrote next day to both Sunderland and Rochester, complaining of his opponents. "If I may be allowed to make any judgment upon this whole consultation," he says to Sunderland, "I must needs say that I do not think they design to have the present settlements confirmed, but on the contrary quite shaken." To his brother he expresses himself very bitterly concerning Tyrconnel. All he himself desired was that the King should know the truth of all sides. "But I do assure you, truth,

even in bare matter of fact, will never be known from my Lord Tyrconnel; which, you may think, I say in anger, but seriously I do not. It is impossible you can believe, except you found it, as we do here, how wonderfully false he is in almost every thing he says. What he desires to be done one day, or avers he has done, he will as positively deny another, though witnesses can prove him in the wrong; nay, though sometimes his own hand is shewed against him. Really his passion and his rage (we know not for what), makes him forget what he says and does; and, when he is convinced that he is in the wrong, he is then in such a fury that the like is not usual." A little later in the same letter he continues: "A great friend of Lord Tyrconnel's told a friend of mine the other day over a bottle that the business which angered my Lord Tyrconnel so much was that he was not in the government; that he would never leave till he got me out, not doubting but he should then be the man . . . If I should be continued, or if I should be recalled and this great lord not succeed me, he will be mad."

On August 16th it was known that the Lieutenant-General had ordered a vessel to be ready at an hour's notice to transport him from Dublin to England, and that he was taking Nagle over with him, "to make projects for Bills." Concerning the nature of these Bills, Clarendon had no doubts. "By the discourses he and his friends make here," he writes to Rochester, "they are such as will turn this kingdom topsy-turvy."

Nagle personally told him that he was going to England on his private account, for his health, and not at all upon anything relating to the public. But in Dublin everyone was convinced that a new Settlement and the calling of a Parliament were the least that was designed.

Tyrconnel's departure was delayed by an attack of illness which for a time confined him to his house at Talbotstown. He intimated that he would be at Dublin on August 26th with his family on their way to England. (This is the only hint which we have that he and Frances had their daughters with them in Ireland now.) Clarendon did not believe in this illness. "It is said he has been much indisposed," he tells Rochester; "and I know people have been to visit him, but refused to see him with this excuse that he was very ill: and yet he rides abroad every day. Some say he had lately an express out of England, which has much angered him by the letters he brought."

On the 23rd Tyrconnel was sufficiently recovered to call at the Castle, where he had another three hours' talk with the Lord-Lieutenant. "Much discourse as loose and as far from coming to a conclusion as at our former conference," Sunderland is informed.

About noon on the 26th Tyrconnel at last went on board a boat for Chester. In view of the rumours in "the very tattling town" of Dublin as to what he was going to do when he reached London, Clarendon

thought it prudent to write to both King and Queen, enclosing the letters in one to Rochester, whom he asked to burn them if he did not approve of them. To James he said: "This morning my Lord Tyrconnel imbarked for England, and, as he says himself, intends to make representations to Your Majesty of some persons, which will not be to their advantage. Possibly I may be in the number; for every man is to be well or ill thought of as they agree with him. I must confess I have not been of his mind in some things; but I am sure Your Majesty will not condemn any man unheard; and so long I am safe." In his letter to the Queen Clarendon defended himself against the expected attacks of Tyrconnel. "Possibly I may be in the bundle of black characters which are carried over," he says. "But as long as I am under Your Majesty's protection I am sure whatever any one shall say to my prejudice will be fully examined before it makes any impression in you."

Probably Clarendon felt more secure of the Queen's help than of the King's; for Her Majesty was still on very friendly terms with Lady Rochester and her husband—a fact which tends to discredit the story of their support of Lady Dorchester earlier in the year—and was no believer in the schemes of the ultra-Papists. With regard to King James, on the other hand, Clarendon, however badly he was informed as to the state of affairs at Whitehall, can scarcely have been under the illusion that he still trusted either

himself or Rochester as much as he did at the beginning of his reign. There is, indeed, a note of too much insistence in his statement, "I am sure Your Majesty will not condemn any man unheard; and so long I am safe."

But, like many another honest man of the period, Clarendon was in a dilemma. He wanted to trust the King, but feared his advisers. Among the friends who tried to comfort Clarendon now was John Evelyn. A letter of his is preserved, written from Says Court in September, 1686, evidently in answer to one from Clarendon complaining about Tyrconnel. "The character Your Excellency gives of the huffing greate man is just," says Evelyn. "How the noyse he makes will operate I know little of; what it does with you (and would everywhere do else) is sufficiently evident. But God is above all, and Your Lordship's prudence, courage and steady loyaltie will, if it surmount not all malevolence, purchase you the estimation of all good subjects, and I doubt not but that of His Ma^tie also."

It would be difficult to imagine two characters more dissimilar than Tyrconnel and "good Mr. Evelyn," as his friend Pepys very justly calls him. Nevertheless, we cannot doubt that Tyrconnel was every whit as convinced as the other that God and all good subjects were on his side; and of the two it was he, not Evelyn, who staked the most upon his faith.

END OF VOL. I.

Printed at The Chapel River Press, Kingston, Surrey

100922